THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1932. Vol. XXII.

IN MEMORIAM

RICHARD BARTRAM TOLLINTON

WITH startling suddenness Dr. Tollinton has passed from us. He had presided with marked efficiency at the meetings of the Governing Body and Corporation of the Ripon Clergy College held at Ripon Hall on Wednesday afternoon, October 19th. He died early on the following Sunday, the result of cerebral haemorrhage. As Chairman of the Governors he had just completed his Appeal for the new Ripon Hall and secured the necessary signatures to it, and was going to post a final letter concerning it when he was stricken down.

Ripon Hall owes him much. He had been a Governor for many years, and succeeded Canon Glazebrook as Chairman and Treasurer in 1924. Unfailing punctuality of attendance, administrative efficiency, social tact, a dignified presence, a fine sense of impartiality, and an enthusiasm, which expressed itself in action rather than words, characterized him in his Ripon Hall administration as in his diocesan work and his pastoral charge.

Educated at Shrewsbury School and Balliol College, he was a true son of each. There was a deep regard for sound learning, a fine breadth of outlook, combined with sincere but unpretentious piety. He was of them who do and say not. He possessed a pleasant gift of humour, which combined with his philosophical studies had enabled him to clear his mind of cant. When one was discoursing to him of the problems of Divine Provi-

dence, he remarked characteristically that it was not the problems but 'the pinpricks of Providence' which perturbed him most.

After his First-Class in Classical Moderations and his Second-Class in *Literae Humaniores* he concentrated on the study of the Christian Philosophy of Alexandria in the second and third centuries when the Christian Religion learnt how to use Hellenic philosophic culture and classical learning to win the Pagan world to Christ. He produced four books on this period. *Clement of Alexandria* (2 vols.) in 1914; *Pyrrho, an Historical Novel*, 1926; *Selections from Origen*, 1929; and *Alexandrine Teaching on the Universe*, 1932. Undoubtedly the first was his *magnum opus*. He had been preceded in England by Bishop Westcott's precise and erudite contribution to Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, by Canon Biggs' *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, and by the studies of Edwin Hatch in his incomparable Hibbert Lectures and Glover's brief and brilliant monograph in *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, but in his particular study Dr. Tollinton contributed much to the fuller understanding of St. Clement of Alexandria.

Dr. Tollinton had much in common with his hero. He found, in the words of John Milton,

> 'How charming is Divine Philosophy,
> Not harsh and crabbéd as dull fools suppose,
> But musical as is Apollo's lute,'

and he was convinced that the Christian Religion has profound need of philosophy in its educational and apologetic work. The humanity and urbanity, 'the sweet reasonableness' of Clement and Origen attracted him. In them rather than in Tertullian, the author of the phrase, he beheld exemplified the *anima humana naturaliter Christiana*. Their consistent, active, Christian lives devoted to Christian education in a spirit of intellectual freedom and comprehensive charity made a deep appeal to him. If he were to be Christian at all, it could only be in that way. Doubtless in this he owed not a little to Benjamin Jowett, the master of his college, and to Bishop Boyd Carpenter, whose domestic chaplain he was and whose son-in-law he became.

Dr. Tollinton did much administrative work in the Chelmsford Diocese as rector of Tendring, rural dean of St. Osyth, and for some years editor of the Chelmsford Diocesan Magazine. He was one of the oldest members of the Modern Churchmen's Union, a member of its Council, a regular attendant at its annual Conferences. He was a valued contributor to the *Modern Churchman* and to other magazines. His last contribution consisted of an article in the *Hibbert Journal* of last July on an imaginary visit of Socrates to Jerusalem. Notwithstanding Thomas Carlyle's *dictum*, Socrates was not 'terribly at ease in Zion.' He felt himself to be in the precincts of a tribal and semi-barbarous religion, and he had no wish to exchange it for his own. The article reflected the conviction of its writer that not Judaism, nor even Jewish Christianity is the destined Religion of Mankind, but the universal elements in the teaching of Jesus Christ set in the framework of philosophical thought.

Enlightened, reverent, and tolerant; a steady opponent of both Catholic and Protestant fanaticism; a sincere believer in the character and call of the Church of England, he represented a type of Modernist who can ill be spared from our ranks.

H.D.A.M.

MARY HARVEY HART

THE Modernist cause has lost one of its oldest and most ardent adherents by the death of Miss Hart on September 26th, at the age of 97. She was a woman of high intelligence and strong personality, and combined the widest religious outlook with self-denying social service. She was a strenuous advocate of co-partnership and the co-operative movement in industry. This brought her into acute conflict with the professional advocates of State intervention and communistic socialism, and the still larger body of selfish individualists. She opposed those methods which seek to do *for* the worker and his master what can only be done *by* the worker and his master. The industrial partnership of employer and employed, the participation of the workman in the profits and prosperity of the master constituted her ideal—the secret of associated instead of divided and conflicting interests.

Miss Hart spent her private fortune in supporting this movement so essentially Christian and so eminently common-sense, and in this was ahead of her times as of ours.

The motto of her life was that of her hero Leclaire, the founder of the French Co-partnership Movement:

> 'I believe in the God who has written in our hearts the law of duty, the law of progress, the law of sacrifice of oneself for others.'

She was a personal friend of two notable bishops, one English, the other American: Stubbs of Truro, the friend of the agricultural labourer and the popularizer in England of the social and religious gospel of Mazzini: and Williams of Michigan, who strove with equal energy and resolution to advance the causes of religious modernism and social betterment in the United States.

H.D.A.M.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A Centenary Manifesto—Rome, the Goal of Spiritual Freedom.

The Oxford Movement was two-headed. One section of the Movement sought to Catholicize the Church of England, but not to Romanize it. John Keble and Dr. Pusey led this section. The other section would be satisfied with nothing less than Romanization. The first section, such is the irony of history, has provided more converts for the Church of Rome than has the second. The deliberate Romanizers have been too zealous and too impatient to do the most effective propaganda. They have not been content with the Pisgah-view of their Promised Land, but have fled incontinently from their desert environment to enjoy its milk and honey. It seems to us, however, that of more recent years the number of deliberate Romanizers in the Church of England has been steadily increasing. A recent document, entitled *The Oxford Movement—A Centenary Manifesto*, signed by some fifty Anglo-Catholic clergy, seems to provide evidence for this. The signatories of the document include, among others, the Rev. Bernard Walke, the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, the Rev. Spencer Jones, the Rev. A. H. Baverstock, Lord Victor Seymour and Dr. S. H. Scott of Oddington. They state their objective plainly and assert that they are extremely dissatisfied with a large number of their fellow Anglo-Catholic clergy, who

are content with Catholicization without Romanization. They complain that:

> 'There is manifest to-day a drift and tendency leading the main body of Anglo-Catholics to depart fundamentally from the religion of the great leaders who began the Movement. It is now infected with a spirit of compromise and Modernism which is gradually leavening the whole and threatens to divert it from its true course. Representative leaders are continually endeavouring in speech and writing to commit the Revival — the rank and file of the followers of which is largely innocent and unsuspecting of such tendencies—to these departures from its origins. So marked a character have these efforts assumed that Liberal theologians, antagonistic to the Catholic Revival and its ideals, have expressed their satisfaction with the extent to which the Movement has become permeated with modernistic teaching. In current Anglo-Catholic expositions of the Faith, novel theories, marked by evasions and accommodations of a modernistic character and contradictory of the historic Catholic position, are frequently set forth. . . . We denounce the culpable silence and acquiescence of the main Anglo-Catholic body in the face of *appointments of Modernists* to important and influential positions in the Church, at the Universities, and in Theological Colleges, and we protest against this insidious attempt to change the character of the witness of the Church of England by according favour and advancement to Modernist teachers. . . . We utterly reject Modernism and reprobate all theories and accommodations of a modernistic character which impugn or innovate upon that Faith so formulated.'

As practical men they are not satisfied with negation and protest. They point to their goal and proclaim their resolution to reach it. Their goal is nothing else than union with the See of Peter, under whose authority they hope to see all orthodox Christendom re-united.

> 'We share *the hope and ideal of reunion* with the rest of the Catholic Church which was cherished by the Oxford leaders and which it was early perceived was included in their appeal. The logic of the principles which animated the original Movement necessarily brought the goal of Reunion to the forefront. Our Lord set up but one Church, the members of which were to be in communion one with another. This One Catholic Church was constituted with St. Peter as its Foundation and Head, and for ever has as its Centre and Guide on earth the successor of St. Peter. This truth we confess, and hence, while striving also for reunion with the Orthodox Churches of the East, we declare that *the real and essential goal* is Reunion with the Apostolic See of Rome. . . . We assert that Reunion with Rome is the logical and highest goal and the natural consummation of the movement celebrated by the present Centenary.'

The leaders of the Roman Movement in the Church of England recognize, however, that there is one insuperable barrier which stands between them and the successful accomplishment of their aim. It is the existing establishment of the Church of

England. Until that is swept away they can have no hope of ultimate success. They write :

> 'With the original Oxford Fathers, we reject *State Control of the Church in spiritual matters* and the Erastian philosophy which attempts to justify it. We see in that control the efficient cause of most of the evils from which we suffer, and in particular of our *de facto* separation from Catholic Communion. . . . We sound once more the call to repudiate prevailing errors : to advance the spiritual freedom of the Church of England : and to labour and pray for that outward unity with the Catholic World and with the Holy See which alone will justify and crown the efforts and sacrifices of our forerunners, and by the grace of God bring the seed sown by the Oxford Fathers to full fruition, and the Oxford Movement to its perfect term.'

We have often pointed out in these pages to a number of well-meaning but muddle-headed fellow Churchmen that the propagandist movement for the 'spiritual freedom of the Church' is in the mind of its clear-headed advocates a movement for the enslavement of the Church of England to Roman Imperialism. Of course the Disestablishment movement is drawing support from a number of churchmen who, like the Archbishop of York, would desire more freedom for the ecclesiastical leaders to shape the Church's policy, principles, and worship without having to secure the acquiescence of Parliament to such changes. But we are persuaded that in trying to secure this ecclesiastical independence they will, if they succeed, only open the doors and give an impetus to the Romanizing movement which they will find themselves powerless to check. They think they can ride the horse, but when once the bridle of the Establishment is removed from the Church of England it will be able to unseat its episcopal riders at will. The Romanizers have no use for an independent national episcopate. Evangelical Churchmen do not regard it as essential. Since the Reformation, episcopacy has never (save in the days of James II, when it was strongly anti-Roman) been popular with the English people. It only carried weight with them because it was the governing order in the National Church. As the heirarchy of a Romanizing denomination in England, it would become more and more of an anomaly and an anachronism amid the rising tide of democratic and secularist public opinion. The episcopate has been endured for the sake of the National Church, but when the National Church ends with Disestablishment, the episcopate must follow it.

An American View of Youth and Religion.

Mr. H. P. Van Dusen in the *Parents' Review* for September discusses the changed attitude of youth to religion in America. He asks such questions as the following:

> 'What, if any, religious instruction should youth be given in the home? What about church—should children be compelled, or even encouraged, to go to church? What should we teach children about some of the more difficult Christian beliefs—the divinity of Christ, for example, the resurrection, miracles, sin, etc.? What should youth be taught about God, and how? Should children be taught to pray? (And how can they be taught to pray by parents who do not themselves pray?)'

He makes the following five points:

(1) 'First, and most important, the oncoming generation views religion from the outside; the generation which is gone knew religion from within . . . To the older generation religion was a familiar reality of internal personal life—as familiar, and as natural and inevitable, as the front doorstep and the nursery, the family pets and daddy's old slippers. Religion had as natural a place in the earliest recollections of childhood as games and meals, the face of a loved Nannie and the excitement of summer holidays. The forms of religion—family prayers; grace at meals (a genuine and reverent grace, not a perfunctory and half-apologetic grace); family occupancy of the family pew on Sunday mornings, and probably evenings as well; the Sabbath, unmistakably distinguished from every other day; Sabbath clothes—these outward forms of religion had as homely and inevitable places as rising and eating, brushing the teeth and going to bed. But let it not be supposed that it was a matter of outward form only . . . The experience of religion—the 'feeling for religion'—had taken as strong and inescapable a grip upon their inmost natures as the moorland, the haunting old ballads, or the touch of human love itself. One could never wholly escape it. In later life, one might forget it, or neglect it, or even repudiate it; but one could never eradicate it.'

(2) 'Not infrequently religion is thought of as something tacked on to the normal experience of life—to make life more beautiful or more comforting or more happy; or, it may be, more exacting, more difficult, more unpleasant. It is one of that multitude of matters in which one *may* become interested if he chooses; but he need feel no compunction to do so, for life is very full and satisfying without religion. In the words of one of our foremost American preachers, "Religion has become an elective (optional subject) in the university of life." I do not know a better statement of youth's attitude.'

(3) 'To the older generation religion and the church were almost identical . . . To the younger generation the church is an institution entirely without meaning or attraction . . . The attitude of American youth in these matters could be summarised in a single sentence—a growing interest in religion, and a deepening indifference to the institutions of religion.'

(4) 'For the older generation, God was the one most certain fact in all existence. For the younger generation, God, if believed in at all,

is a guest whom we admit to the chambers of our thought rather tentatively and only after rigorous scrutiny.'

(5) 'With the older generation, the most characteristic approach to religion was through the moral life. Religion, while it contained a body of beliefs and created an inner experience, was even more typically a matter of certain things to be done, a certain kind of life to be lived. Its deepest meanings clustered about such words as "duty," "moral imperative," "consecration," "surrender," "dedication" . . . Careful scrutiny reveals that the interest (of youth in religion to-day) springs from two desires; youth is seeking from religion one or both of two things. Some are seeking a "philosophy of life" (no phrase is more frequently on their lips)—some interpretation of the universe and the meaning and purpose of living. Others are seeking from religion a certain kind of experience—what, half-articulately, they would describe as an experience of "completion" or "fulfilment." In other words, youth's interest in religion is predominantly intellectual or aesthetic . . . The older generation approached religion primarly through their wills, the younger generation through intellect or emotion.'

Mr. Van Dusen mentions three reasons why these contrasts exist between our grandparents' attitude to religion and that of their grandchildren in this generation of modern youth—why, in passing through our hands from our elders to our children, religion suffers devitalization and death:

(*a*) 'Intellectual uncertainty has raised questions about the validity of the central convictions of religion.'

(*b*) 'Much more important, preoccupation with other and more alluring interests has gradually displaced religion from the only status in which it can ever endure as living and sincere—the place of absolute centrality among life's interests and absolute command over life's loyalties.'

(*c*) 'We have attempted to perpetuate religion by transmitting it, like a dead tradition or a mummified treasure, from one generation to another; when, by its inmost genius, religion requires to be born anew within every oncoming generation and within every individual in each generation.'

In the last section of his article Mr. Van Dusen turns to answer those questions from which he started. He asks first of all: Should youth be given religious instruction in the home? He answers with an emphatic affirmative. Religion from its earliest beginnings is a matter of contagion. Again, what should we teach our children? And how? Teach the child what you believe yourself, no more and no less. Do not teach the child to pray unless you pray yourself.

'When you send children to Sunday school and do not go to church yourself, when you encourage children to pray and do not pray yourself, what are you really doing? You are teaching youth that religion is wholly an affair of childhood and, by that token, a childish

affair. You are sentimentalising religion and all of its expressions. You are affirming your own conviction as plainly as it lies within your power to do so that God is one of the beautiful and sentimental myths of childhood, exactly like Santa Claus and fairies . . . If prayer has not sufficient meaning for it to hold a small place within your own practice, then in the name of all that is holy, do not desecrate it by pretending to teach your children to pray . . . It is far better that you should give us youth wholly without the pretence of religious training than youth deeply impregnated with the idea that religion is the affair of the immature. For, if there be a God at all, it should be clear to even the most stupid or perverse among us that he is no Santa Claus or mythical Peter Pan, to grace the imagination of early years and then to be put off like short breeches and long curls, but the one primal and most significant fact in the universe . . .'

And if we are to answer for ourselves the most difficult question of all, what we are to teach our children, we must be prepared to go back to school, to learn afresh the truths which perhaps we have ourselves neglected, to acquire that religious belief appropriate to maturity, which is competent to hold its own against every query of honest doubt or querulous cynicism.

Father Woodlock and Infallibility.

The Rev. Fr. Woodlock, S.J., the *malleus modernistarum* and most untiring of Roman Catholic propagandists, in a recent paper on *Modernism in relation to Reunion* delivered before the Reunion Society at Pusey House, Oxford, at which Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, and a number of other Churchmen were present, is reported in the *Oxford Mail* of November 1st as saying:

'Once all infallibility is denied, as it is to-day by most Anglican theologians, the claim of Modernism that there should be alternative creeds for the use of those who deny the miracles of the Gospel should logically be granted. . . .'

'If the creeds are not infallibly true, they cannot rightly be imposed on all members of the Church.'

Father Woodlock quoted Dr. Headlam's denial of any infallibility in any Church. In reply to a definite question from Father Woodlock as to whether the Council of Nicea and the Nicene Creed were infallible or not, the Bishop of Gloucester denied the infallibility of both.

Of course when Dr. Headlam made this declaration in the presence of an audience consisting mainly of Roman Catholics, Anglo-Catholics, and Greek Orthodox, he caused what the French journalists describe as 'a sensation,' yet to a questioner, who insisted on a categorical answer, the Bishop only asserted what all English clergymen assent to when they subscribe the Thirty-Nine Articles.

Article XXI, dealing with the authority of General Councils, expressly asserts

> 'forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.'

The dogma of the infallibility of the Church is open to serious objection on three grounds. First, it is exceedingly vague. For some it means the infallibility of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* on Christian Faith and Morals, for others it means the decrees and decisions of the General Councils of the Church, for others it means the *consensus fidelium*—the assent and approval of the great body of faithful Christians. In face of the number of Anti-Popes it is not always easy to decide who is 'the Pope,' and it is much more difficult to decide when he is speaking *ex cathedra* and when he is not.

Again, there is a doubt about the General Councils. English Churchmen acknowledge the authority of the first four, the Greek Orthodox acknowledge the authority of seven, Roman Catholics acknowledge the authority of a great many more, including that of the Vatican Council some fifty years ago, when it decreed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope.

As to the *Consensus fidelium*, it has varied much in different ages and in different places. The *quod semper*, *quod ubique*, *quod ab omnibus creditum est* of St. Vincent of Lerins does not really mean what it seems to mean to the plain man: chasing the Infallibility of the Church through this tangled maze of claimants is like hunting for a needle in a haystack.

When these so-called infallible decisions are secured by the eager searcher, they are found to be in a number of cases not in agreement with one another. Infallible Popes have contradicted Infallible Popes, and Infallible General Councils have contradicted Infallible General Councils. The patient reader of George Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* can find there these statements proved up to the hilt.

Not the least serious objection to the Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church is that it expresses in a wrong and detrimental way what is more rightly and profitably conceived of as the Inspiration of the Church—the guidance of the Divine Spirit

in the Church's efforts to decide rightfully what is true and right in the face of doubts and difficulties. This Divine Inspiration is conditional, and depends upon the state of the individual or corporation which seeks enlightenment. The promise of inspiration does not guarantee infallibility, but vouchsafes to earnest faithful souls guidance into necessary truth. It comes, as Bishop Westcott would have said, 'through life and not through logic,' or as Dr. Illingworth has expressed it in a golden sentence :

> 'The Christian religion refuses to be proved first and practised afterwards ; its practice and its proof go hand in hand.'

Oliver Cromwell on one occasion when addressing a body of Puritan divines said :

> 'I beseech you in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ to conceive it possible that you may be mistaken.'

The Calvinist dogmatist is as little able to do this as is the Catholic dogmatist. The humble, faithful, striving Christian cannot hold any such comfortable conviction of infallibility. It is much too mechanical a doctrine; it ministers to spiritual pride; it checks the progress into all truth which is the quest of Christian Pilgrims. 'We are none of us infallible,' said a Christian sage, 'not even the youngest of us.'

The Theology of the Future.

Professor Charles Raven in his inaugural lecture before the University of Cambridge, published under the title of *Signs of the Times*, or *Some Reflections upon the Scope and Opportunity of Theology*, speaks in the tone and style of the preacher rather than the professor. The rank and file of the clergy and not a few of the practising laity will appreciate this. He points out that theology, in general estimation, has failed to meet three particular charges :

(*a*) 'It professes to deal with ultimate reality, but apparently its method of so doing is to take refuge in a supernatural region whose chief characteristic is the contrast between it and the natural order. If it be true that the things which are seen are temporal, while the things that are unseen are eternal, this will only be of value if there is a clear and vital connection between time and eternity. Theology, in setting the two in antithesis, has provided not an inspiration for the good life but a refuge for those who can be persuaded to turn away from the stress

and effort of living to the contemplation of fancied rewards and the bliss of escape from the world. "We live," such critics would urge, "in an age of urgent practical challenge: certain great human needs, personal health, sexual welfare, social reform, economic security, international peace, enlist our whole attention: we do not see that the Athanasian Creed or the Book of Common Prayer have any bearing upon our problems: and whenever we appeal to you, we find you engrossed in controversies which to us are dull, irrelevant and destructive of your claims to leadership."

(*b*) 'In the past religion has provided men with an authority to which they can appeal. The Church, the Bible, the life and teaching of Jesus Christ—these have been used, often most beneficially, to guide and inspire human conduct. To-day we find the theologian disputing endlessly about details of ecclesiasticism: we know your denominational differences, and realise your interest in them: but upon us their effect is simply to destroy the hope that the Church can exert authority. So, too, with the Bible: it may no longer be possible to put it forward as a complete, consistent and uniform revelation: but in your interests in details of dating and authorship of its several parts, you have ignored its message and dissipated whatever confidence we had in its inspiration and validity. Finally, while we agree that neither Church nor Bible are in the old sense infallible, we hope to find in your presentation of Jesus Christ what we look for in vain elsewhere. You can see from the multitude of the popular lives of Jesus Christ how strong is still His appeal. Yet you seem to us concerned rather with the text and inconsistencies of the evidence about Him, with details of sources, of accretions, of historical and antiquarian research, than with the presentation of His Gospel or the witness of His Person. Those of us who cannot, like many of our fellows, dismiss religion as irrelevant to life, come to the theologians and receive only stones.

(*c*) 'Finally, your claim, as we understand it, is to proclaim a way of life. You tell us that religion brings power to live abundantly and that theology explains the secret sources of such power. If the tree is known by its fruits, we have the right to look to the effects of your work in your behaviour and in your influence upon others. We would not judge harshly: we would not be indecent in our demands: but can you convince us by practical proofs that your work has this transforming and inspiring result? How far does the testimony of your conduct bear out the claims of your profession?

If so direct a challenge is indelicate, we would put our difficulty otherwise. Your students are mainly candidates for the ministry, young men who will spend their lives in presenting religion as an evangel of power to the people oppressed by the tragic hardships of the struggle for existence and obsessed by a sense of helplessness and perplexity. How far does theology help these young men to discharge their task? Does it send them out full of love and joy and peace and fortitude, and able to infect others with the fruits of the Spirit? Are they trained to deal with the problems of conscience and conduct, to express a Christian message in relation to modern social and industrial conditions, and to uphold a Christian civilization against humanistic materialism and world despair? Are we wrong in associating theology with abstruse knowledge of ancient languages, customs, and beliefs which have little or no bearing upon the needs of to-day?'

Professor Raven does not identify himself with this criticism but has much sympathy with its motive. It is the expression of three clamant needs. The first is the need for unity—

> 'unity not only in the realm of international and interracial relationships, but, as the basis of this, in the acceptance of a common purpose of life and common ideal of life. The progress of civilization has broken down the old independence of tribe, nation, or empire, and threatens evident suicide unless some machinery for universal co-operation can be created. Machinery alone will fail, even if under threat of disaster it could be constituted, so long as there is no agreed loyalty to principles of abiding validity. It is useless to expect integration among groups, so long as the individuals who compose them are themselves the victims of false and conflicting philosophies. Unification of character in individual or group or commonwealth can only be achieved under the influence of a common aim sufficiently exalted to satisfy all the highest elements in our nature. Such an aim involves a coherent interpretation of the meaning and worth of existence. If it is to be compelling, it must satisfy not only man's intelligence but his emotional and moral nature. It must, in fact, be a religion.'
>
> It is difficult for many of us to understand how this paramount need for religion as alone able to lift us beyond the ingrained partisanships and parochialisms of our heritage can be denied by any thoughtful student of the world-scene.'

The second clamant need is the need for the reassertion of the primacy of personality and of personal relationships. He regards the passionate desire for self-expression as due to this. He believes that the revolt against authority, especially that of convention, is prompted by this motive. He is convinced that behind this revolt is the desire of the individual

> 'to assert himself against the tyranny of the impersonal, the mechanical, the standardized.'

We rather doubt the correctness of this analysis. Our discontents to-day in the world of labour, or rather of unemployment, are due to causes which concern men's food and housing, their beer and tobacco, their pleasure and leisure. Mr. Henry Ford's and Sir William Morris' employees are the envy of their fellow-workmen, who have no objection to standardization provided that it gives them adequate wages and permanent employment. Our labour discontents are due to the absence of these to-day.

Canon Raven complains that the departmental nature of our modern studies has had the effect of depreciating, if not of eliminating, the concept of personality: in this we agree with him:

> 'We have had a period of intensive analysis, when the custom of interpreting the whole in terms of a selection of its parts was accepted

> as obvious. We have seen the living organism split up into varying bundles of assorted elements; chemists, biologists, psychologists and philosophers have analysed us, and declared that we, the persons concerned, are mere by-products of the factors that they have disclosed. We have had to explain away all that is distinctive in the higher activities of humanity and been urged to adopt the primitive and materialistic as the norm of our nature. That strange era in the story of man's mental life is perhaps passing, as the recognition of the wholeness and uniqueness of personality rises from the failure of purely analytical methods.'

Undoubtedly there is need for synthesis, but synthesis to be worth anything should not be premature. Analysis must proceed to its furthest point before synthesis can usefully be achieved.

> 'Oh, if we draw a circle premature
> Heedless of far gain,
> Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
> Bad is our bargain!' *

The absence of the spirit of *The Grammarian's Funeral*, like that of Virgil's Good Husbandman, who plants trees of which he will never eat the fruit, is the real cause of a great deal of the discontents of the horde of self-indulgent sentimentalists, who desire to wear the immortal garland but without the dust and heat of the contest. The scientists may neglect the formulation of idealist philosophies, but at least they provide an admirable example of patient industry: and we are not sure but that present-day youth is in more need of the latter than the former.

The third clamant need according to Professor Raven is 'the need and craving for power':

> 'It is aroused by the sense of the contrast between our desires and our attainments, between what is and what might be. It is this which is responsible for our present defeatism and despair. And this despair is as much the cause as it is the consequence of our difficulties.'

This is no new need. John Milton wrote: 'Weakness is man's true misery,' and he also added in another place 'weak men are for hastening things.' To this sense of weakness Dr. Raven assigns the origin of many of our religious cults and superstitions. His remedy is the Christian remedy. It is only in the active and whole-hearted service of that religion that 'men will attain fulness of life and a right relationship with their environment upon earth'—'a realm of eternal values' and 'a fellowship of fully-integrated personality.'

* Robert Browning, *The Grammarian's Funeral.*

In conclusion, he asked how far is theology meeting these needs. He viewed with favour Dr. Tennant's and Dr. Oman's recent contributions to philosophical theology, and hoped that by means of adequate team work it might be possible to construct a modern *Summa Theologiae*. He regarded as one of the hopeful signs of the times that there is a very general desire to study the Bible in the light of modern knowledge. He added:

> 'It is the whole purpose of this lecture to urge that in this day of specialization, a unifying of our interests is essential alike for personal welfare and for world-wide security; and to suggest that this task devolves especially upon those who are called to the service of theology.'

We hope that Canon Raven may prove to be for the Faculty of Theology at Cambridge, what Professor Sanday was in his day for the Faculty of Theology in Oxford.

Methodist Reunion and After.

On September 20th the formal act was completed by which the three branches of the Methodist Communion in this country (Wesleyan, Primitive and United Methodists) were reunited under the title of the Methodist Church of Great Britain and Ireland. In some ways the achievement has been an easy one, for from the first all parties were agreed in doctrine and worship. They differed only in administration. It has, however, taken fifty years to reach this happy consummation, and all who desire the unity of Christendom must join in offering their sincere congratulations on the successful achievement of the Methodist reunion movement initiated by Sir Robert Perks. It is a national religious event which deserves to rank with the not less memorable and fruitful reunion of Scottish Presbyterianism.

In view of recent events, we may well ask whether Methodist reunion seems to promise reunion with the Church of England in the near future. We wish that we could think that it does. While a number of Methodist ministers might welcome reunion, we are sure that the bulk of the Methodist laity are opposed to it. They dislike above all things the prevailing ritualism in our services and the sacerdotal claims of many of our clergy. Were the Church of England dominantly evangelical and modernist, reunion with Methodism would present no great difficulties; but since our Church appears to them to be dominantly Anglo-Catholic, we cannot hope for reunion with them until important

changes have been made in our own Church temper and practice. We are, so they hold, intolerantly dogmatic in our teaching, sacerdotal rather than pastoral in our ministry, sacramental and ritualistic in our worship; and all these features repel them. Those English Churchmen who have so desperately opposed the South India scheme abroad may be relied upon to offer a resistance to Methodist reunion on liberal lines with the Church of England at home, in such a way as to split that Church itself in two. Reunion with the Free Churchmen at home, of whatever denomination, is at a standstill till we English Church people have learnt to place first in our Church's life those things which Christ placed first in His Gospel. It is in that direction, not in diplomatic ecclesiastical negotiations, that we must hope to secure Christian unity where it is most needed. As Modernists, we are of opinion that inter-communion must precede—and perhaps by a long way—the consummation of ecclesiastical organic unity.

THE LAYMAN'S VIEW OF REUNION

By Lieut.-Colonel E. N. Mozley, D.S.O.

WHILE, taken as a whole, there is little or nothing but good in general inter-communion, partial inter-communion is, or is likely to be, a dialectical gesture and accordingly a dangerous weapon. The inter-communion which is being established or proposed with the Old Catholics and with the Orthodox Church is, so long as we refuse equal inter-communion to Presbyternians and Nonconformists generally, a re-orientation of the Church of England. Those who are arranging these matters are doing so in a manner which is not being brought to the knowledge of the laity, and I believe they could never carry the laity with them in the present one-sided proposals.

Let me attempt to base my argument upon a rock, the rock of what would be our Lord's will. When I read His words in the Gospels and consider His outlook, I am at a loss to understand how anyone can maintain that He would deny communion in His own supper and sacrament to all Christian men of goodwill. I know that quoting texts is an occupation at which all

sides can play. I will only quote our Lord's words when He replies to the suggestion of His disciples that He should rebuke one who was casting out devils, not in His name: 'He that is not against us is on our side.' But it is not to an isolated text, strong though it be, but to Christ's whole spiritual mentality that I appeal. He had nothing of the sectarian spirit in Him, nothing of the spirit of the precise ecclesiastic, nothing, I would go so far as to say, of the theological dogmatist. That spirit came later. It is surely plain that Christ would have welcomed a Presbyterian and a Wesleyan in every way as warmly as He would an Old Catholic or an Orthodox Churchman. I myself think that these English denominations are nearer to His ways of thinking than are those other Churches.

'There are different administrations but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operation but it is the same God which worketh all in all.' That is plain enough. We cannot all think quite the same way or like quite the same methods, but we are God's children and should not refuse to meet each other at His great Service of Communion. That is why I say that nothing but good can come from general inter-communion. But partial inter-communion is quite another matter. When you have consistently refused to join in the supreme service with one set of your fellow Christians, and then propose inter-communion with another set, what is to be thought? And what will those whom you have rejected think? It must appear as a gesture, not only of kindliness and a Christ-like spirit, but also, alas, of denial and bigotry, and it must inevitably be so interpreted.

And it is bound to have results. It is undoubtedly a re-orientation of our English Church. Those whom you make your friends, to those you will especially resort, and to their ideas you will inevitably and not unwillingly approximate your own. It is beside the point to say that the Old Catholics are a small body. Once it is established that we are in communion with them, and still more with the great Greek Church, much will be bound to follow, if at the same time we consider Non-conformists, in the supreme issue, as spiritual 'untouchables.' The Church of England has always claimed to be a bridge between the Catholic and Orthodox on the one hand and the Reformed and Nonconforming Churches on the other. But here

is wired up the approach on the one side and the approach on the other opened out and improved. It is no longer a bridge : it is an outwork. Who are the Old Catholics, and what is their way of thinking? I will quote from an article in the *English Church Union Gazette.* The school of thought in the Church for which that Union stands is in no doubt as to why it should rejoice at this approaching inter-communion :

> ' In faith and practice Old Catholics are not to be distinguished from other Roman Catholics. They think of themselves as such . . . In effect they say to the Pope, " We are Roman Catholics ; you are our chief spiritual pastor." . . . Even after sixty years they still regard their " Churches " as only provisional expedients until the Papacy withdraws their excommunication. If that were done to-morrow, they would merge into the general body of Roman Catholicism and would render the present Pope exactly the same honour and loyalty which they rendered his predecessors before their excommunication. It was thus that they hit happily upon the designation of Old Catholics in order to indicate their faithfulness to Roman Catholicism as it was before the Vatican Council transformed it.'

These are the people to whom we are now offering inter-communion. Do not let us mistake the issue. They are Christians, as we try to be, and we would be friends with them in spiritual essentials. But to be friends with them and refuse full spiritual friendship to Nonconformists is wrong. And can we really believe ourselves nearer *in sacris* to the Old Catholics than we are, say, to the Presbyterians?

What is it that the Bishops at Lambeth have always considered the insurmountable obstacle to inter-communion with Nonconformists? It is the question of episcopal ordination of Christian ministers. Yet there is nothing about bishops in anything our Lord said or seemed to intend. And all are aware of the interminable discussion, which may never be settled, as to the meaning of '*episcopos*' in the New Testament, and as to whether the three Orders (as opposed to functions) can be detected in the New Testament at all. They certainly did not exist in our Lord's time. We have to go to post-New Testament days to get clear evidence of their existence, and here I ask, why are we so sure that the Church of the early centuries was right in these things? We *cannot* be sure. This appeal to antiquity does not carry much weight unless, indeed, we go right back to Christ. I believe antiquarianism is a great danger to which the Church has always been open. I believe in the

great text, 'The Spirit shall guide you into all truth'; but this indicates a process, and the mistake as I see it lies in the implicit contention that the process is, at any point, completed when first the Church gives judgment. True guidance is on a far bolder and far more natural scale. As a great Catholic has said, 'o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent'; that is to say the Church — as our Articles assert — may err, and has erred, and only in the far-off outcome will it have cast off all error. I wonder if one would recognize the Church of Christ as it then will be? In the meantime, I protest against being tied to anything that the more victorious of certain Greek theologians said some fifteen hundred years ago. I think it quite probable that in many important dogmatic matters they were none of them right, and they were certainly wrong where they were intolerant. The future is more than the past. Mankind grows in spiritual stature as well as in scientific attainment.

To return, then, to the Lambeth objections to inter-communion with Nonconformists. Some clergy will say, 'We do not refuse inter-communion to the Nonconformists. We only ask their ministers to submit to episcopal re-ordination. We ourselves are ready to submit to any form of commission from the Nonconformists that they appoint.' But can it really be thought that the sacrifice or intellectual admission is an equal one on both sides? Obviously it is not. The Nonconformists are asked implicitly to admit that they have not been fully commissioned as ministers of Christ before they can enter into communion with us, while they ask for no such admission. In this we ask too much. More important, it involves an untruth. I believe that Christ *would* consider the Nonconformists fully commissioned. How then can we expect them to think otherwise? I am firmly of opinion, and all laymen I know are also of opinion, that this point of difference regarding episcopal ordination between us and Nonconformists is as nothing compared with the great difference of outlook, and ritual, and to some extent of belief, between the laity of the Church of England and the laity of the Old Catholic and the Orthodox Churches. I have spoken of the former, and I will add one word about the Eastern Church. It is this. I have been to an Orthodox Church service, and to my English mind it is almost

meaningless. The service—of the Sacrament—is carried out by the priest behind a screen, from which he intermittently and rarely emerges to shew the sacred elements or to do some ritual action. That may suit the Eastern European mind; to an Englishman it seems of little value. Canon Wigram, who knows and likes well the Orthodox Church, vouches that on a certain occasion the priest, who is supposed to be behind the screen for three hours, was somewhat lazy and curtailed his time considerably. The faithful laity did not approve. They knew he had left something out—what, they did not know—and they reprimanded him for slackness. To an English mind, a very odd service! If the English Church is going to take up the position that it is nearer to such folk than it is to Presbyterians, at least the laity will never agree with such an astonishing view.

These considerations raise a vital issue within our own Church. I suggest that if the laity were really aware of these partial Reunion proposals they would by a huge majority altogether disapprove of them. It is mathematically true that if you select at random a small number of samples of a general class, the attributes of the selected specimens will proportionately be the attributes of the class. In the last month or two I have put the Reunion question, as fairly as I know how, to layman after layman, and what I found was this. Firstly, they knew little or nothing about what was going on at Lambeth; secondly, they were most anxious and eager for general intercommunion; and, in the third place, they were perfectly clear that they were *in sacris* much nearer to English Nonconformists than to the Old Catholic or the Orthodox Churches. Most of them were rather horrified at the line the Church authorities were taking, but they always ended by saying, 'Well, I suppose the clergy mean to do it, so I suppose they will.' Further, to the laity the spectacle of the Church of England seeking at the hands of the Church of Rome 'recognition' of the 'validity' of its orders, while refusing such recognition to Nonconformists, has always been a spectacle, perhaps amusing, certainly not edifying. Here let it be said that the laity of the House of Laymen are a peculiar proposition, somewhat out of the usual run, and certainly anything but representative of the average well-meaning, undogmatic Englishman.

If on the one hand there is to be inter-communion with Old Catholics and the Orthodox Church, and on the other hand continued refusal to inter-communicate with Nonconformists, the layman will shrug his shoulders and say, 'Well, it's not my idea of the English Church.' Why do not the clergy find out for themselves where the laity stand by putting these Reunion proposals frankly before them, in sermons? Why are these vitally important *rapprochements* only referred to in one or two short and obscure paragraphs in a very few principal English newspapers, and in Church literature, diocesan magazines and the like, which go almost unread by the mass of the laity? Let the clergy announce to their congregations that on a certain date they will be addressed on these vitally important proposals, and on the attitude of the Lambeth Conference, evident in the fourth point of the 'Quadrilateral,' where is stated the necessity of re-ordination for Nonconformist ministers before Reunion with them is possible. Let the clergy ask laymen and laywomen to write and state their views. Or let the clergy hold a discussion in the church hall. If the clergy hesitate to ask the layman's view of Reunion, is it not because they very well know what his answer will be? If I have myself been assertive or overbearing, I would plead that it is only because I think I realize the gravely critical nature of the decision about to be made, and because I want my Church to act as I think her Master would have her act, that I have written as I have written.

There is, I repeat, the acid test, in considering this question of inter-communion, namely, 'What would our Lord desire?' And is there anyone who can sincerely answer, 'He would have desired inter-communion with the Old Catholics and the Orthodox Church and refused it to the Nonconformists'? Such an answer would travesty the Christ of the Gospels.

'AN ERASMIAN CARDINAL OF THE COUNTER-REFORMATION'

By G. K. Brown, B.A. (Cantab), Ph.D. (Edin.).

ON the 11th of October, 1534, thirty-five Cardinals met in Conclave to choose the next wearer of the Papal tiara.[1] The choice was not long delayed, for, after an exceptionally short period, Alessandro Farnese was elected, partly, it is true, by reason of the political situation and the absence of an intellectual peer, but also largely by reason of his possession of a delightful personality. Of such a personality and every gift, Paul III—for such was the title Farnese assumed—had the greatest need in meeting the situation with which he was faced. Under his predecessor, Clement VII, Italy had suffered politically as she has rarely suffered either before or since: the Italian Renaissance had ended in the Sack of Rome, and Western Christendom was definitely divided into two camps. This last problem alone could never be solved by any one man, and all Paul's most excellent intentions could have met with no more than partial success. But he did start well, and what he achieved in the early years of the Pontificate merits the closest possible attention.

To analyze, or even to catalogue, the various assets he possessed for conducting the Catholic reform of the Church would be too long a task here, even if it were relevant. As in all instances of projects for reform, there was not unanimity among the proposers even on the most important details. Advocates in high places for reform in head and members appeared in Rome itself years before Luther raised the standard of revolt.[2] At the Lateran Council in 1512, one finds Cajeton, the Dominican Scholastic, strongly emphasizing Papal supremacy as *the* safeguard against schism. With equal sincerity Zane de Spalato, Patriarch of Venice, recommended the curbing of the passion for dominion.[3] The latter preacher was a Christian Humanist,

[1] Vd. Pastor's *History of the Popes*, Vol. XI, for all details.

[2] Maurer & Hermelink, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, 1931, p. 221.

[3] Vd. Hefele-Leclerq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Vol. VIII, Pt. 1, pp. 335, 351-352, for the outlines of these and other sermons.

but far more conservative than Egidio Canisio da Viterbo, for whom the eradication of blemishes and the stimulation of uprightness were over two-thirds of the task of reform.

Egidio's sermon is in essentials the counterpart of the historic Convocation sermon preached by Colet in England at almost exactly the same time. Both alike placed the greatest weight on moral and spiritual renewal, and when the Lutheran storm broke out, Egidio, who outlived Colet, only insisted the more on the necessity of opposing the healing of the physician to the noisy apologetic-building and denunciation of the patient by the Curialists of both good and bad varieties. Thus Paul III found on his accession sincere advocates of reform divided, even if not yet sharply, into, broadly speaking, two camps each with a respectable tradition. Things began to move readily from the very beginning of the Pontificate. Following the presentation to the Pope of the memorial of the jurist, Caccia da Novara, Paul III declared in November, 1534, that reform of the Curia was urgently necessary. Soon afterwards, men of the type of Contarini were raised to the purple, and in 1537 the epoch-making *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium et allorum praelatorum de emendanda Ecclesia* was signed by Paul's reform Commission of Nine — Contarini, Carafa, Sadoleto, Pole, Fregoso, Aleander, Giberti, Cortese and Badia.[4] As in Colet's Convocation sermon, reference to heretical pravity has no place in the *Consilium*, which elevated the solicitude for moral welfare to such a pitch as to condemn by name the *Colloquies* of Erasmus. Even this extraordinary confession on the part of the hierarchy does not, however, strike us so much as the unanimity of voices generally so widely different as those of Carafa and Sadoleto. Although the subsequent hardening of the dogmatic crust was to be after the growing desire of the Carafans, and was to supplant rather than supplement the working out of the reforms advocated by the Commission of Nine, the 'mediatizers' were not without considerable influence till the early 40's. Nor were all the influential mediatizers included in the celebrated Commission, for one of the greatest was, at the time of the

[4] Vd. Pastor, *op. cit.*, Vol. XI, p. 142 *ff.* The 'Consilium' is given in full with the signatures in Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, 1911, pp. 307-318, and is conveniently summarized in Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, 4te Auflage, 1924, pp. 267-270.

signing of the memorial, but 28 years of age, albeit already Bishop of Modena for eight years and a trusted diplomat in the service both of Clement VII and Paul himself. This was Giovanni Morone.

Morone was born in 1509, therefore in an Italy then at the height of its Renaissance glory and corruption, and in a Europe through which wandered Erasmus and others like-minded in the search for a synthesis of piety like unto that of the early Church and the best in contemporary thought. And just as Erasmus both wandered and benefited mightily thereby, so did the young Milanese, notwithstanding the considerable difference between them in education and experience. For although educated like the average Italian ecclesiastic in the Law Schools, Morone was little disposed either to exaggerate the Papal supremacy in terms well known to the lawyers of the Curia or to pulverize the foreign opposition to the age-old legal caste presiding in the centre of Christendom. The diplomatic missions he undertook, in 1529 to France and in 1535 to Milan, doubtless prevented any stagnation of thought, but his departure as Nuncio to Germany in 1536 far exceeded the two earlier missions in importance and made him amenable to influences the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen never understood.

The work Morone accomplished between that date and 1540 in Germany is itself at one and the same time a testimonial to his ability and to the foresight of the Pontiff who sent him beyond the Alps. His reports are, however, chiefly those of the diplomat and lawyer, and his regard for the See of St. Peter is, as evidenced by these dispatches, very much as one would expect. The words used by Cochlaeus in a letter addressed to Morone in 1538 might well be the latter's own: *firmiter credo sedem apostolicam habere auctoritatem suam de coelo*.[5] And, indeed, such an opinion Morone always maintained. Hence he resents the 'customary' attempts of the Lutherans to calumniate the Holy See,[6] and is fearful of the possibility, whilst at Breslau

[5] *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. XVIII, p. 281. Friedensburg's Briefwechsel.

[6] *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland,* Abt. I, Bd. ii, p. 137. Letter to Ricalcati from Prague, April 2nd, 1537. 'Aspettano li Lutherani per captare secondo il solito le occasioni di calunniare la sede apostolica.' 'Firmly do I believe that the Apostolic See has its authority from heaven.'

in 1538, of a widespread revolt from the Roman authority.[7] It is therefore not hard to believe, in view of this continued respect for the Papacy, that even in 1555, after wider and bitter experience as Nuncio to Germany, he would faithfully defend Papal authority in negotiations.[8] Yet the function of the Pope he regarded as not only to govern, but also to govern *well*, and at no time does this idea more clearly emerge than in 1540 and 1541 —the period of the *Colloquies*—when purely religious matters begin to occupy a good deal more of the diplomatist's attention. There are at least three documents belonging to this period which are of consummate importance, exceeding by far the mere biographical interest and occupying a prominent position in what is designated by that very misleading term, the 'Counter-reformation.' The first is a letter addressed from Hagenau on June 8th, 1540.[9] Here Morone refers to two types of ordinance in the Church, the one divine, permitting as such neither dispute nor change, the other human. These latter ordinances were introduced at different times the better 'to reduce man to the true worship of God.' The needs of the present time may make a change in these latter ordinances necessary both to Germany's peace and to the cause of reunion, though it is of course assumed

[7] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 308. Letter to Farnese of June 14th.

[8] Vd. Pastor, *History of the Popes,* Vol. XIII, p. 225 *f.*

[9] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. v-vi, p. 426. '(Paul III) mi havea dato commissione, che dovesse ammonire i prelati e principi cattolici del debito loro, e praecipue S.S. la quale di tal esperientia e dottrina, etc., etc., acciochè non si facesse qualche sinistra e diabolica conclusione. pero gli recordava, che quando in questa dieta si fosse trattato della religione come si ragionava, che S.S. dovesse havere avanti gli occhi, che nella fede e nella religione nostra sono ordinationi divine, alcune humane, e quanto alle divine, che non si potea in particolare convento per alcun modo mettere in disputatione quello che la chiesa cattolica ha sempre sin qui creduto e osservato; quanto alle cose ch'erano iuris positivi che similmente S.S. dovea considerare l'innovation de nuovi essere molto pericolosa; perchè si può ben credere che la chiesa di Dio regolata dal Spirito Santo sempre sia andata limando i riti e habbia introdotti gli ordini più atti a ridur l'huomo al vero culto di Dio: nondimeno se la diversità de tempi ricercava mutatione, che questo si dovea fare auctore praetore, id est con autorità di N.S. oddel Concilio, essendo S.S. capo della chiesa, . . . e che mi rendea certo, che S.S.te, vedendo esser necessario o espediente alla quieta di Germania, e alla unione, non sarebbe stata difficile in relassare qualche cosa secondo l'honestà e senza detrimento della religion nostra: pertanto concludea che S.S. non volesse consentire che in questa dieta si tratasse degli articoli principali della religione e che degli altri positivi, non consentisse che si facesse mutatione alcuna senza l'autorità della sede apostolica, la qual come vescovo era obligato di osservare e conservare quanto potea.'

that the decision on such matters be reserved for Pope or General Council. The possibility of a bigger break in Christendom, which would mean the further repudiation of Papal authority, together with an appeal to a Diet in which the laity interfered as against a Council reserved for ecclesiastics, obviously haunted the Nuncio Morone. These fears he never ceased to express, and in this letter to Farnese he was doing no more than reiterating opinions expressed to Farnese two years before: things in Germany are bad, he had written in 1538 from Prague,[10] and the Diet itself is likely to take up the question of ecclesiastical reform—an occupation fraught with serious danger to the Pope and to the faith. None the less, however, did he expect any more in 1538 than he did in 1540 and 1541 that schismatics could be reconciled without concessions on the part of the Pope;[11] his Holiness might be absolute, but his despotism must be both enlightened and liberal in this matter. Hence, whilst the lapsing into heresy of 'all Germany' must be strenuously countered, those already in schism, he maintained in 1540, are to be no more murdered than dealt with by amicable negotiations.[12] These two methods are useless, and the Pope must pro-

[10] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 250. 'come più volte ho scritto, tanti sono li desordini di questa Germania . . . . che si tratti del reforatione della fede.'

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 289. In the letter to Farnese of May 15th he suggests possible dangers from the side of Lutheran offers at compromise. These offers may draw 'all Germany' away from allegiance to the Pope, 'se per S. Santità non sarà prevenuto in li trattati del concilio a fare qualche concessioni a questi popoli, quali si possono fare salva pietate, come tutti desiderano.'

[12] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bde. v-vi, p. 154. '. . . la qual religione non par da principio convenga essere trattata per via di guerra . . . . la guerra più tosto può estinguere gli huomini che le heresie,' (as *e.g.* in Bohemia). 'La seconda via . . . . per ragione e per esperientia non solo e periculosa, ma ancora dannosa, perchè li conventi si fanno tra li principi e dotti lutherani, quali (come ho detto) per passione e per malitia vanno a mal camino: perhò non si può fare guadagno a trattare con simili persone, oltre che le loro opinioni (fondate come dicano nella scrittura) parena colorate, e le nostre verità in alcuni capi non havendo aperte probationi nella scrittura sacra, alla quale sola essi voglieno credere, ma nelle traditioni date dagli apostoli e continuate sino al presente tempo, mal si potranno confirmare, mancando l'autorità e il consenso delle nationi e essendo redutte le cose in pocchi, quali in parte potrebbono restare convinti, in parte non potrebbono convincere gli adversarii, della qual cosa seguirebbe che gli adversarii in molte propositioni restassero superiori e noi in nessuna, e nondimeno non sarebbe provisto all'honor di Dio e alla salute delle anime.' Vd. also his condemna-

ceed by Conciliar action. (This truly Erasmian characteristic —his dislike of force against heretics—was later to form one of the charges against his orthodoxy.) In this same letter to Sforza, the second of our three documents, wherein are expressed these latter views, he recognizes that the Lutherans, even if through passion or malice, are on strong ground in their repudiation of the authority of tradition.

A Pope who could both conserve and realise was the great need, and it was only natural that Morone should appeal for ecclesiastics of like ability and ideals. The letter addressed to Sforza advocates nothing new when it urges the rejection of 'amicable negotiations' on the ground of lay interference therein: he wrote expressing fear of a provincial council in 1536, and often returned to the subject.[13] The imminence of such a danger must be met by hastening on the Council which would forestall such a gathering. There is little reason to believe that Morone ever wavered much on the point of the respective authorities of Pope and Council. In 1560 he quoted to the Emperor a remark of Contarini's to the effect that the Pope gives both the authority and the power to a Council, and at the same time succeeded in getting modified the expression, 'reform of the head of the Church by the Council.'[14] The desperate need for the Council was, however, with Morone, neither simply a case of stealing a march on the Lutherans nor of offering an opportunity to put heretics beyond the pale for all time. It is not surprising therefore that 'the blind passions of the princes' —of no matter what communion—which drive on Protestants in the direction of a National Council, and will eventually drive Catholics in the same direction, are frequently attacked.[15] So too was he fearful of an Empire-wide Diet of both parties in Germany, and apprehensive of the Lutherans' attitude towards the Council. He clearly wished the Lutherans to be present. Only once, in 1537, and that for particular reasons, did he re-

tion of force on either side in a letter to Aleander of December 17th, 1536. *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 83.

[13] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 79*f*. Letter from Vienna to Paul III, December 17th, 1536. Vd. on lay interference, *Historisches Jahrbuch der Gorres-Gesellschaft,* Vol. X, p. 661.

[14] *Pastor,* Vol. XV, p. 320*f*. This occurred after his appointment as Legate by Pius IV to the resumed Council of Trent.

[15] Vd. the letter mentioned in note 13.

joice at the postponement of the long-projected Council[16]: at a later date, in 1546, there appears to have been on the question of the translation of the Council an acrimonious discussion between Carafa and Morone.

The hint of Ephemerides at an altercation between Morone and the fire-eating Cardinal Carafa in 1546 need occasion no surprise.[17] It is quite clear that long before that date each ran in a different groove, and there seems to be some *pique* later in a letter of 1556 wherein Morone tells us that Carafa, then Paul IV, 'was so penetrated with the idea of being the representative of Christ, that he considered an offence against his own dignity as an insult to God.'[18] This bigoted fanatic, at whose hands Morone eventually suffered so much, never was the ideal type of ecclesiastic for him. But the sense of responsibility to the cause of the Church was so strong in Morone as to move him to reject a von Stadion as readily as a Carafa. Von Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg, reputed to be more Lutheran than Catholic, possibly in consequence of his reputation was regarded by Morone as a *persona non molto sottile*.[19] These two extreme types he rejected in favour of one who possessed something of the best in each extreme and almost nothing of the defects of either. What was necessary at Hagenau was 'a person of authority, doctrine and purity,' and he goes on, 'it seems to me that the Rev^ma^ Contarini is that person.'[20] A few months later we read of his faith in Contarini as a disputant and director of

[16] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 234. Letter to Ricalcati from Vienna, October 10th, 1537. 'La dilatione del concilio . . . . mi ha però portato grandissimo piacere.'

[17] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ix, p. 191. Santa Fiora to Farnese from Rome, August 17th, 1546. 'Per le lettere di V. S. Rev^ma^ dei 9 del presente Sua Santità intese la risolutione che l'havea presa di consenso dei Rev^mi^ legati che si coprasedesse la translatione del concilio insino di nuovo avviso. . . .' An editorial footnote runs: 'Nicht ganz klar ist die Notiz der Ephemerides zum 9 August: habitus est cardinalium senatus de concilio differendo. ea res tum, Imperatoriis resistentibus impetrari non potuit, Tranensi acrius querente agi ut intermitteretur quod imperatoris auctoritate et praescripto decretum esset. eadem causa Theatinus et Moronus (*sic*? der Name ist undeutlich geschrieben) contumeliose inter se jurgarunt.'

[18] *Pastor,* Vol. XIV, p. 69.

[19] Dittrich, *Morones Nuntiaturberichte.* Letter of May 26th, 1540, to Farnese, p. 133.

[20] *Morones Nuntiaturberichte,* p. 118. Letter to Paul III from Ghent, April 17th, 1540.

the Catholic scholars at the Colloquy.[21] and a third letter speaks of the wide popularity of the celebrated Contarini in Germany.[22]

Of the relations between these two eminent ecclesiastics from that year 1540 till the death of Contarini soon afterwards space forbids me to speak at length. The Venetian Cardinal, interestingly enough for long an important layman, was not the product of the Law Schools like the much younger Morone, but since the issue of the 1537 *Consilium* the two outstanding experts in Italy on German affairs were bound to come together. Yet another reason for the friendship can be found in Italy. Like eminent bishops of the type of Giberti, Contarini had both preached and practised since his institution in the Bishopric of Cividale di Belluno in 1536 the government and regulation of his diocese as befitted a saintly bishop. In 1538 we find Morone petitioning for his own recall from Germany the better to attend in person to affairs in his own diocese. How pressing he deemed the duty of episcopal residence to be is evidenced by another letter not three weeks afterwards seeking the same boon. Two more letter follow in the next month, then three more : when the desired permission was at last granted in the August of 1538 his joy was unbounded.[23] One cannot but feel that his experience of the unfortunate state of affairs in the religious life of Germany was also a potent factor in deciding him to seek his recall to the diocese of Modena, which he had no wish to see in a similar plight through his own non-residence. He had observed the position in the Tyrol, Bavaria and Austria,[24] and in one of the very letters seeking his recall to Modena he talks of the prospect of the complete disappearance of 'brethren of every order in Germany.[25] But it was not only the lack of clergy that

[21] *Ibid,* p. 166. Letter to Farnese from Hagenau, July 1st, 1540.

[22] *Ibid.* Letter to Farnese from Leyden, August 10th, 1540.

[23] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, pp. 251, 266, 268, 280, 315, 317, 334, 336. Others were aware of Morone's love for episcopal duties. Vd. the letter written from Rome by Carnesecchi to Guilia Gonzaga on August 31st, 1560 (*Scrittori d'Italia,* Vol. I, 1913, p. 111). 'Mi piace sommamente che quel buon prelato disegni di retirarsi alla sua chiest. . .' *Cf.* Morone's attitude in 1566; *Pastor,* XVII, 181.

[24] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 79. Letter to Paul III from Vienna, December 17th, 1536.

[25] *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 268. Letter to Farnese, April 2nd, 1538. '. . . senza alcun dubbio al presente vi sono più monasterii che frati; la qual cosa pare incredibile a chi oculatamente non lo vede.'

troubled him. In a letter addressed from Prague in 1538, one in which he was petitioning for recall, he complains loudly of ecclesiastical abuses in those parts. The evil, he contends, aggravates so much as to drive people out of the Church.

This need for a moral reformation among ecclesiastics, emphasized so strongly in these expressions of opinion on the urgent need of a recognition of their proper responsibilities, together with that dislike of persecution hitherto mentioned, inspired in Morone a feeling towards those outside his Church which has always been far too rare. When, in 1537, Sadoleto was being hotly attacked by numerous co-religionaries for making approaches to Melancthon, Morone wrote him a letter of sympathy in which he talked of the 'many reputed defenders of the Catholic faith who think our religion consists solely in hatred of the Lutherans.' These, he says, are sufficiently uninstructed to attack all negotiations with Lutherans and the use of all language not abusive. 'If only this course (*i.e.* that of charity towards heretics) had been adopted from the start, there would probably be less difficulty than there is in bringing about the reunion of the Church.'[26] Striking as this is, it is rather in the 'Recommendations' of 1541, the third of our three documents, that Morone appears at his best as a reformer.[27]

To give the whole of the document that has been made so conveniently accessible for us by Dr. Cardauns is not possible here, but a summary of it is indispensable.

> 'At the very beginning of the Bishop's "considerations and difficulties" occurs "the lives of bishops, who live like princes," imitating the lordliness of the latter and utterly neglectful of their spiritual duties. In his desire for one like Contarini to attempt reformation he had also expressed the need (*vd.* the letter from Leyden, August 10th, 1540, to Farnese above cited) of *in ogni modo persons dotte.* Such learned persons he believed the Theatines to be: these he advocates as being more likely to "enkindle good spiritual ardour" in such a materialistic environment, but chiefly because of the "extraordinary lack of priests."[28] The way he suggested of meeting the terrible need

[26] *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte,* 1904, pp. 80-81. This highly important letter is very briefly summarised also, very much as above, in Benrath's article, 'Morone,' in the *Realencyklopädie,* 1903, Vol. XIII, and in Thurston's article in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia.*

[27] *Bibliothek des Kgl. Preussischen Hist. Inst. in Rom,* Bd. 5, 1910, pp. 205-209. L. Cardauns, *Zur Geschichte der Kirchlichen Union und Reformbestrebungen.'*

[28] *Cf. Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 268. Letter to Farnese, April 2nd, 1538. Here is mentioned a request of the Elector of Brandenburg, of the nature of which we are in ignorance (vd. the editorial footnote) concerning

of suitable theological instruction, probably the most interesting feature in the whole document, is best given in his own words. "And because to each it is permitted to teach what pleases him, it would be essential to have a certain form of doctrine, such as one might have for the purpose of reading and preaching and teaching everywhere. Perhaps the form of the *concilio Coloniense,* in part well revised,[29] would be useful in the absence of a better." [30] As noteworthy as the recommendation of the *concilio Coloniense* is that of the treatment of the Lutherans, to which he often referred. Heresy has almost as little place in the document as it had in the celebrated Convocation sermon of Colet thirty years before. "There are many excommunications on the score of apostasy, irregularity and heresy; to meet this it would be necessary to have not only the authority to absolve all who come to repent, but also to be able to give it to all ordinaries, or to other commissaries deputed in the name of the Apostolic See in every diocese, or at least province, according to the need . . ." To win over the many learned men in the Lutheran camp, Morone naturally held, is a worthy enterprise fully deserving of sacrifice on the part of the Roman authorities. To regain such as Butzer, one could possibly allow them to keep the wives they already had and find them not inaccessible to persuasion.' [31]

Morone had frequently advised compromise with the Lutherans, but he had never previously given such indication of a the-

---

something probably prejudicial to the Carthusians. These religions, says Morone, are hemmed in by Lutherans, and almost all the brethren are dead.

Pastor, *Die Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen,* 1879, p. 298*f.* More than 1,500 parishes were without priests. Morone, who worked closely with a zealous reformer, Cardinal Albert of Mainz, was told by the latter that all his priests had concubines.

Another reason for the dispatch from Italy of members of the new Order of Theatines for this work was that these would put the cure of souls before purely individual sanctification. This implicit attack on the older Orders was accompanied by an attack on wealthy livings: benefices' superfluity should be dispensed for the poor. The latter view is near Colet's.

[29] Canones Concilii Provincialis Coloniensis, 1536. Parisiis, 1550. Vd. also Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation,* 1911, p. 351. Varrentrapp (in addition to his valuable monograph, 'Hermann von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln,' 1878) on Hermann in the Realencyklopädie. '1536 berief der Erzbischof ein Provincialkonzil; es billigte eine Reihe von Reformdekreten, die der damals am erzbischöflichen besonders einflussreiche Johann Gropper redigiert.' Vd. also Varrentrapp in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. XX, p. 37*ff.* — 'Zur Charakteristik Hermanns von Wied, Bucers, und Groppers.'

[30] 'Forsi la forma del concilio Coloniense, in alcun luoco ben revista, sarabbe al proposito, quando non vi sia migliore.'

[31] 'Saranno alcuni Lutherani gia sacerdoti o monaci, come esempli causa sarebbe il Bucero, quali trovandosi coniugati non voranno lasciar la moglie, et nondimeno nel resto sarebbero forsi reducibili.' *Cf.* a letter from Prague to Ricalcati on April 19th, 1537. *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. ii, p. 148. Confallonero also had great hopes of the return of both Butzer and Melancthon. Vd. his letter to Morone from Weiner-Neustadt on January 26th, 1541. *Nuntiaturberichte,* I, Bd. vi, p. 227.

ological drift in the direction of doctrines not far removed from the Lutheran position. Gropper's Erasmian reform schemes, which clearly shone through von Wied Archbishop of Köln's earlier efforts, and his *Regensburg Book*, were as little palatable to the Carafans as was coquetting with Butzer.[32] Nor was Morone's attitude towards both moral and dogmatic reform to be reserved for German problems only.

The details of his dealings with the Academicians of Modena I cannot enter into here. Morone's extreme leniency towards those in Italy who faltered in the faith was a byword,[33] and his relationships with them offered ample scent for the bloodhounds like the Dominican Scotti.[34] Here I will do no more than draw attention to the articles accusing him in the trial instituted by Paul IV, together with relevant letters of Jesuits, all alike dating from a time when most of the Erasmian Cardinals, and especially Contarini, were dead.

> 'On the 1st of June, 1557, Paul IV at a General Congregation announced the issue of orders for the arrest of Morone on the charge of heresy, of which since Paul III's days the present Pope has suspected him.[35] Cardinal Pole and the Vicar of Cardinal Carpi were also indicted along with Morone.[36] The Twenty-one Articles of accusation I have given in a translation elsewhere, and here, both on account of space and relative importance, I do no more than summarise the charges levelled therein. Morone was accused of openly deviating from "the Catholic faith taught, held, and preached by her" (*i.e.* the Church), Art. I. He had denied both orally and in writing the finality of the Tridentinum on Justification, and had supported the Lutheran view (Arts. II, III, IV). The Papal spiritual primacy (Art. VII), priestly absolution as generally accepted (V, VI), the invocation of saints, the cult of Mary, and the veneration of relics (X-XIII), the legality of war

[32] Eck himself, who seems to have been less intractable than Carafa, was no lover of the theology of Pighius, which Contarini and Gropper (vd. Lauchert's article on Pighius in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*) and also Morone came to adopt. In a letter of February 15th, 1541, the Ingolstadt professor expressed to Morone dislike of Pighius on St. Augustine and St. Anselm, and told him a month later that Pighius 'suaviter est tractandus et a singularitatibus abstrahendus.' *Zeitsch. f. Kgeschichte,* Vol. XVIII, pp. 262 and 473.

[33] Vd. especially Dittrich, *Gaspara Contarini,* 1885, p. 807 *ff.* The last chapter but one of my book, *Italy and the Reformation* (not yet published) deals with Morone and the problem of Modena.

[34] Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 293.

[35] Vd. Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 289 *ff.* 'The Trial of Cardinal Morone.'

[36] For the Articles, vd. Schelhorn, *Amoenit. Litterariae,* Bk. XII, p. 570 *f.* Pole was saved by death from sharing Morone's subsequent humiliations. Vd. the letter of Carnesecchi to Guilia Gonzaga, *Scrittori d'Italia,* Vol. II, p. 103. Letter dated from Venice, February 25th, 1559.

(XV) he was said to have denied. Quite naturally, much was made, not only of his encouragement of notoriously heretical writings like the *Beneficio di Christo,* but also of heretics and "persons suspected of heresy" (XVI-XXI).'

Morone met the accusations boldly, and steadfastly refused, even when imprisoned, to appeal to the Pope's mercy.[37] By so doing he refused to admit himself in the wrong and, I believe, thus fought the last rear-guard action of the mediatizers with the rigorists. Some of the charges, like that of his supposed denial of the invocation of saints, he repudiated point blank; others he met by pleading indiscretion. And, truth to tell, denial of the finality of Conciliar definition he seems never to have suggested.[38] But on the other hand, it is quite evident that he regarded the pre-Tridentine state of affairs as *different*—more liberal, and therefore more congenial for a mediator—from what it was then in Paul IV's and in the later post-Tridentine days. Is it not significant that, first of all, in replying 'Morone dealt with his attitude to the Regensburg formula of 1541'?[39] Neither the rejection of the Regensburg view of justification, nor the subsequent condemnation of the *Beneficio di Christo* had then taken place, and the Inquisition had not yet begun to function as it eventually did.

According to Pastor,[40] Morone's defenders made out that he

[37] Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 299.

[38] *Cf.* supra on Conciliar authority in Morone's view.

[39] On the Regensburg Book, vd. Eells in the *Princeton Theological Review,* July, 1928. The final form of the articles of the 'Book,' first drawn up by Gropper, is in *Corp. Reformat.,* Vol. IV, p. 190*f.* Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 294. I do not wish to overestimate the liberalism of the 1540's. There are numerous expressions like that of Melancthon to Camerarius (quoted by Ranke, *Die Römischen Päpste,* Bd. I, p. 106) in 1541: 'adsentiuntur justificari homines fide et quidem in eam sententiam ut nos docemus.' One also remembers the words of Pastor (*Die Kirch. Reunionsbest.,* p. 288): 'Im besondern ward dem Nuntius noch anempfolen, sich gegen die Protestierenden nicht feindselig, sondern liebevoll zu erzeigen.' Rome was, however, not prepared to concede at Hagenau at that time even the Cup to the laity. 'Firmiter tenendum est, non esse iure divino praeceptum, quod laici sub utraque specie sumat euch aristiam, neque hoc ex evangeliis, epistolis Pauli et factis Christi colligi potest' (Lämmer, *Die vortridentisch-Katholische Theologie,* 1859, p. 251). He had not so important a rôle assigned to him later at Worms and Regensburg.—Vd. Brieger, *Contarini und die Regensburger Concordienwerk,* 1870, p. 4. (Morone) 'war freilich zum Wormser Gespräche nicht speciell abgeordnet.' Vd. also Corp Ref., III, 1184; Moses, 'Die religiöse Verhandlungen zu Hagenau und Worms,' 1889; and Friedensburg, 'Zur Geschichte des Wormser Konvents,' in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. XXI, i, p. 112*ff.*

[40] Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 296.

had advocated the use against the Lutherans: this writer offers no documentary evidence on the point, and seems here conveniently to forget Morone's consistent dislike of compulsion in religious as distinct from political matters. Morone's fluttering round the Lutheran candle is admirably demonstrated, even if no evidence could be found for it elsewhere, in the Jesuits' correspondence.[41]

In 1547, Salmerón reported to Loyola that Morone was prepared to help in promoting the scheme for a Jesuit college at Modena. The same letter suggests no little uncertainty on Salmerón's part as to how to approach the Cardinal,[42] and, though I do not press it, the Jesuit seems to hint at Morone's being in none too enthusiastic a mood in his replies. According to a much later statement of the Cardinal on affairs in Modena in 1543, Salmerón was gladly received by the Bishop as an able opponent of the Lutherans. But very soon controversy began between them on the treatment of heretics, 'good works,' the Mass, and priestly absolution.[43] It is true that Morone candidly acknowledged his offence against the Society, but I contend that the confession — for such it is — seems to run too easily to discount the application of compulsion to the Bishop, and that contention is borne out by a letter of Laynez to Salmerón in 1560, when Morone was released from prison:

> 'Neither after he (Morone) came out of the Conclave, nor when I entered therein, did he show towards the Society the bad spirit we have had, and have with him.'[44]

The Jesuits worked for his liberation, we know, but neither that fact nor his subsequent friendly relations with the Society till his death in 1580, disprove the view that for him the *Consilium*,

[41] Monumenta Historia Societatis Jesu: *Epistolae P. Salmeronis*, Tom. I (1536—1565), 1906.

[42] *Epistolae Salmeronis*, I, pp. 52-53. '. . . estava en duda si hablaría al cardenal Morón, o no: . . . todas estas respuestas me dió en breve y algo mas enxuto de lo que pensava, como hombre recatado y que esta sobre sí.'

[43] Vd. footnote to pp. 52-53: also Cantu, *Gli Eretici d'Italia*, Vol. II, p. 182. Against Salmerón, who appeared to Morone to be 'bien dotto ed instrutto contro Lutherani,' the Academicans and the Governor both complained. Then Morone objected to Salmerón's doctrine: 'Io, non avendo pazienza, . . . credo che dicessi molte inezie.'

[44] *Epistolae Salmeronis*, I, pp. 354-355. Letter of January 7th, 1560. The original Spanish from which I translate here runs: 'Después que sallió del conclave, ni allá dentro quando entré, no mostró mal ánimo con la Compañía como havemos tenido y tenemos con él.' An editorial footnote says, 'in Societatem ex veritatis ignoratione offendit. . .'

Contarini, Cortese, and the other mediatizers — Renaissance Catholicism at its best—was dead. Morone's friendship with the Jesuits was less one with theologians than with educators, for like a true Erasmian he always held education to be *the* means towards the perfect Reformation.

The education was of a much narrower type than that Morone yearned for. But then, to use Pastor's words, 'he, a prelate of the time of Leo X, had not had a thorough theological training.'[45] The possession of this requisite training, it would appear, is confined neither to Innsbruck Professors like Dr. Pastor nor to Jesuits! The post-Tridentine Church as a whole — and by that one means the modern Roman communion — manifests a remarkable inability to digest either the theology of certain Leonine prelates or that of Modernists. Dr. Kidd, in his interesting lectures on the Reformation given in Oxford classrooms, reminds us that the Reformers protested against the relative Roman perversions of their age. Things have changed: quite so. But if the vices have gone, the dogmatic strait-jacket has become far more prominent, and we must therefore still resist, if on grounds different from Luther's. As against Dean Inge, therefore, I would urge with Heiler in his *Katholizismus* that there is an important difference between pre- and post-Tridentine Catholicism. There was room for Morone's theology in the former age, but not in the latter. If we agree with Pastor that Morone was consistent, then we may not argue for the consistency of the thought of the Roman Church from the beginning to the end of the sixteenth century.[46]

[45] Pastor, Vol. XIV, p. 298.

[46] Philippson, *La Contre-Révolution réligieuse*, p. 546, says that in the 1563 Legation (vd. G. Constant, *La légation du Card. Morone pres l'Empereur et le Concile de Trente, Avril-Dec.*, 1563,' Paris, 1922), Morone was no longer in thought as he once was. *Cf.* also Brieger (*op. cit.*), who maintains the same point of view. Some indication of the increasing rigour in the Church in proportion as the Jesuit strength grew is given in Reusch, *Indices librorum prohibitorum* (Litterarischen Verein in Stuttgart, Tübingen, 1886). Della Casa's Index of 1549 includes Marsiglio of Padua on the temporal power (p. 140), and the 'Beneficio' (p. 141). That of Milan and Venice of 1554 contains the Acts of the Regensburg Colloquy (p. 148), and the mediatizer Fregoso's work on prayer (p. 157). Paul IV's of 1558 has the Colloquies of Cochlaeus and Luther (p. 182), and, as though to crown all, the 1580 Index of Parma contains the Works of Cardinal Contarini (p. 584). On the hardening of the dogmatic crust, vd. Fawkes in *The Modern Churchman*, Vol. XVII, pp. 318-319.

RELIGION: SUPERNATURAL OR SPIRITUAL*

By the Rt. Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.D., D.Sc., F.R.S.,
Bishop of Birmingham.

'Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?'—*Luke* vi, 41.

AT the present time, if we may judge by our newspapers and by sermons in what is called the religious press, the pulpits of England ring with complaints and laments. Preachers complain that fundamental Christian doctrines are denied and that Christian moral principles are repudiated. They lament that in the realm of sexual ethics the new morality is a dangerous snare. Apparently — I trust that my epitome is fair — the typical man of science, confident, aggressive, humorous, is mainly responsible for a state of affairs much to be deplored.

Well, I confess that I am not personally a moral revolutionary. The natural and Christian morality by which a man takes pleasure in the company of his wife, and enjoys being with his children as they grow up, seems to me to have much in its favour. There is, in fact, so much to be said for it that I do not share the often-expressed fear that it may be overthrown.

Furthermore, I believe that the teaching as to God which we derive from Christ constitutes the best explanation that we can get of the origin and purpose of the process which has produced humanity. Man's duty and destiny, as Christ set them forth, harmonize—or so it appears to me—alike with out deepest religious experience and with the principles on which alone civilization can be soundly developed. Thus I accept fundamental Christian dogmas.

But I would add that our preachers seem to me too busy with attack and complaint to notice the extent to which Christian leaders are to blame for that contempt which the Christian standpoint often receives. Have the Churches consistently maintained the highest moral standards? Can any Christian investigate the records of the Roman Church with regard to marriage and divorce alike in medieval and in modern times without a feeling

* A sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, Oct. 9th, 1932.

of shame? What bodies of Christians apart from the Quakers condemned war when the great conflict of 1914-18 was upon us? Individuals were loyal to Christ's teaching: the Churches were dazed. Western civilization is a cultural unity in which the various nations are so intimately joined that war between them is irrational. The Christian Churches would not only in the end win respect but they would also save our civilization were they effectually to preach peace. But in regard to peace and war they are 'neither cold nor hot.' Again, the social evil which has increased most disastrously in our time is gambling. In Ireland the Roman Church is all-powerful and the Dublin hospital sweepstakes flourish. I personally have no doubt that such hostility to Christian sex-morality as exists at the present time derives much of its strength from the evasions of accredited Christian teachers and from their refusal to examine the hardships and injustice prevalent in our social system. A franker confession of past failure and clearer insight into the relation of present needs to eternal principles would at once win men's regard.

But it remains true that social morality is closely bound up with religious belief. If Christian teaching as to God is doubted or flouted, men will naturally build on other foundations: and the violence of a recoil from early instruction may appear in the moral principles which they who have abandoned Christianity set forth.

Now, unfortunately, there has been, for the past generation, a lamentable recrudescence of false ideas as to the nature of the Divine rule of the world. Such ideas, borrowed from Roman theology repudiated at the Reformation, have spread disastrously through the Church of England; and the prestige of our Church is still such that what is taught in our pulpits is accepted widely in England as orthodox Christianity. Down to the middle of the nineteenth century our leading divines were fairly closely in touch with the best philosophical and scientific thought of their time. Their approach to the doctrine of God was empirical. In other words, they were willing to accept that view of the nature of God's rule of the world which can reasonably be derived from observation. They would have repudiated any suggestion that there was contained, in the works of Thomas Aquinas or elsewhere, a compendium of revealed truth which had the first claim

on their allegiance. They believed — as I believe — that the revelation of Christ would grow naturally into our expanding knowledge: but any suggestion that new truth must be repudiated, or twisted to accord with old assumptions, would have made them indignant.

This attitude, moreover, is the only one possible if a quarrel between science and dogma is to be avoided. We can learn of God by studying His works and ways. The proper beginning of theology is to learn of the Creator from His creation. If the man of science by careful observation and honest thought reaches new conclusions, the theologian must embody such conclusions into his view of nature or by equally honest thought must show how they are mistaken. A mixture of casuistry and invective is no adequate substitute for the arguments of a trained mind.

Unfortunately, for a generation past a view of the mode of God's operation, which is radically false and fundamentally non-Christian, has been in the ascendant in the Church of England. Let me describe it. According to Christ's teaching the whole realm of nature is subject to the sway of God. Within that realm spiritual faculties, emergent in man, have developed with the development of mind. We can therefore, in contrasting man at his highest with his animal instincts, or with the blind forces of nature, put the spiritual in opposition to the natural. Yet the spiritual and the natural belong alike to God's realm: they form a unity: and the laws of spirit do not contradict the laws of nature. Moreover, in making these statements, I am saying nothing that is incompatible with the view of the world which we derive from modern science.

But this division of God's realm into the natural and the spiritual does not satisfy our theological decadents. They crave for magic and pretended miracles of healing and the conferring of a spiritual character on inanimate objects. So a division is made into natural and supernatural. In the natural realm the laws of nature are supreme: in the supernatural God is supposed to set these laws aside and to give special grace or confer exceptional powers.

Now the word 'supernatural' does not occur in the Bible, and the theory of a supernatural realm existing in opposition to a realm of nature is indefensible. It dishonours God. The *whole*

realm of nature is His. His writ runs everywhere. His grace is given through every kind of natural channel. There is no mechanism, no magical process, by which men can acquire supernatural gifts.

Let me illustrate these truths. For some years past, if I may judge by the daily picture papers, some clergyman—he may not be unique—has had at his church an annual service of blessing of motor-cars. I assert that such a service is a mockery of Christian truth. We can rightly pray that God will bless a person: His grace does, so my experience assures me, come to those for whom we pray in love. But to bless a machine confers upon it no spiritual character. The idea belongs to the realm of mere magic. You are just as likely to have an accident in a motor-car which has been blessed as in one that has not been the object of any such ceremony.

Take another example. We can, as I believe, rightly pray that God will relieve us in sickness or pain. Often the prayer is unanswered: then we must be content to say 'Thy will be done.' Sometimes, as we think, a favourable answer is given. But then we have no reason to assume that God has acted otherwise than by natural channels. Divine answers to prayer do not belong to a fabulous region of the supernatural.

Some considerable time ago a woman thought she saw, near a spring of water in the Pyrenees, a vision of the mother of Jesus. From that incident has arisen a cult, as irrational and as pagan as any connected with the so-called sacred shrines of healing in antiquity. It is the duty of Christian teachers who wish to retain the respect of boys and girls trained in scientific method to assert that no well or shrine can convey a supernatural grace of healing. Wherever we may be, we can reach God in prayer. There are no places or things, sacred shrines or saints' bones, that have supernatural curative properties.

Similarly, if oil be blessed by a priest or bishop, it does not thereby acquire any healing virtue. Yet it is symptomatic of religious decadence that men should desire to add a service of unction, in which oil is to be so blessed, to a liturgy which we owe to our less superstitious forefathers.

Once again. In the Holy Communion we draw near to Christ as we remember, in a service intimately connected with His last

supper with His disciples, His self-sacrifice for righteousness' sake. With such associations the Eucharist is especially sacred and, I believe, spiritually helpful to all Christians. But when one is told that by some supernatural process, as the result of the prayer of consecration, the Spirit of Christ becomes attached to, or inherent in, the bread and wine, then from the heights of spiritual religion we have descended to magic. As I have heard Dean Ryle say from this pulpit, 'There is no magic at our altars.' God comes directly to the devout worshipper: He does not dwell in inanimate objects, and the whole service of Holy Communion is the channel of His grace. Such is sound Anglican teaching; and because the abortive Prayer Book of 1928, as I believe, went back on such teaching, it was rightly rejected by Parliament. There is no point in keeping the consecrated elements in a church save on the false assumption that they are supernaturally endowed with the presence of Christ.

I need not give further examples of the religious teaching, alike unsound and anti-scientific, which is all too prevalent to-day. I would reiterate that, in so far as it has crept into our own Church, it is degenerate Anglicanism. But more especially would I insist that to such superstitions as I have described science can give no quarter. If they become established among us, men of science will develop independently a more truly spiritual religion free from such absurdities; and in the end their religion will more faithfully represent the teaching of Christ.

Some may demur to this statement and point out that representative scientific teachers to-day in England repudiate belief in God. Some leading men of science make such repudiation: others do not. It is impossible to assess the intellectual eminence of the respective groups. But without fear of contradiction I can say that certain scientific men of the highest eminence accept the teaching as to God which we owe to Christ. I know that the existence of so much evil in the world makes it hard to understand how God is both all-powerful and all-loving. But when a distinguished thinker can suggest that God, if He exists, must be worse than Nero, he has allowed pessimism to lead him into exaggeration. Though there be much evil in the world, the good far outweighs it. Moreover evil has its use in the world as we know it. By struggling against the blind forces of nature and

his own animal passions man has emerged out of barbarism; and I believe that, if we view the evolutionary process aright, we can see that the progress within it has been towards ever more successful attempts to overcome a hostile environment.

The Universe, as we know it, is a unity. If we may judge by the creation of man upon this planet, there is within the unity purpose and plan. The finest outcome of the purpose of which we have knowledge is man with his moral sense and spiritual capacities. The facts thus briefly stated point, as I believe, to rule by the God of Christ's revelation. I have, then, no fear that either unfettered criticism of Christianity or free scientific enquiry will in the end destroy the fundamentals of Christian belief. Neither do I see any reason to anticipate that any truly valuable elements of our moral tradition will perish. But it is the duty of all of us who profess to follow Christ to reject superstition and to take care that we strive to preserve such moral principles as are in very truth Christ's. He is, as Tertullian finely said, Truth, not tradition. I would add that also He is wisdom. Of the civilization created by His wisdom science is the child. It will not repudiate its Lord.

BOOK REVIEWS

LIGHTFOOT OF DURHAM*

All readers of the *Modern Churchman* should make sure of reading this book, if only because the foundations of all that is truest in the position they stand for, will here be found firmly and constructively laid by one of the great Cambridge trio, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort. Note the second adverb, for Lightfoot's work is never merely destructive.

Who shall weigh the comparative greatness of men? Surely none of us. Yet asked recently by a friend whom, in my long life and my distant travels, I regarded as the greatest man I had known, I found it hard to place anyone above the subject of this book.

Great as he assuredly was, not perhaps conspicuously so, yet adequately even according to the world's rough measure, but certainly very great by the standard of God's measuring line, as revealed in Christ; great throughout his whole career with a truly Christ-like greatness.

How many of the leading ecclesiastics of the near past have, in some degree at least, desired, if not actually sought for, their posts of leadership? Honours, dignity, fame sought out Lightfoot, not he them. This also was the spirit with which he imbued those whom he loved to call 'the sons of his house,' and which has largely prevailed amongst them ever since,

* *Lightfoot of Durham.* Memories and Appreciations collected and edited by G. R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald. (Cambridge University Press. 7/6.)

and to which this book bears eloquent and often silent witness. Part of their birthright always was so to act and live as he would have approved and wished.

If Lightfoot should seem only a name now to men of this generation, let them begin by reading here Bishop Headlam's contribution (pp. 136-141) and Bishop Eden's sermon[1] (p. 148). Their interest will be assured.

If to-day attacks on the Bible after the manner of Bradlaugh and his school, or of Baur and the manner of 'Supernatural Religion,' have been rendered futile in the face of scientifically defensible positions, built up by two generations of noble-minded scholars; if we have learned that the Bible is to be interpreted like any other book, even though it will still prove itself superior to any other book; if Alford's New Testament, and (most of) the Speaker's Commentary, have been superseded by the 'International Critical Commentary,' or the last three 'One Volume Bible' Commentaries, it is largely due to the example set by Lightfoot's writings and by his fearless search after truth, from whatever quarter it came; by his refusing to 'close the door of enquiry by the hand of authority,' and by his constructive witness to unimpeachable facts. 'I cannot pretend,' he said, 'to be indifferent about the veracity of the records which profess to reveal Him whom I believe to be not only the very Truth, but the very Life.' Herein his constant aim and the whole end he sought. It is because it reveals this, and shows us a mighty mind fulfilling a simple purpose, that this book is to be welcomed, and that the privilege of reviewing it, accorded to one who knew him well and loved and revered him greatly, is a sacred and solemn one.

On the day the book appeared I was sitting at Cambridge in the room of a Trinity Fellow who had known Lightfoot at Cambridge, and on my mentioning its title, he remarked, '"Lightfoot of Durham"; but surely his greatest work was done at Cambridge?' Readers of the book will think differently, yet had the future Bishop not laid the foundations truly and wisely at Cambridge—and of this proofs are here forthcoming—there could not have been built upon them the miracle-story, as it seemed to many, of how a shy, gauche, unwieldy Cambridge don could blossom out into a dignified, practical, much-loved Bishop, 'one of the greatest,' says Dr. Headlam, 'if not the greatest, of modern English bishops.' How Lightfoot changed the whole life of the Diocese of Durham, and how Westcott, his successor, also a college don and full of mysticism and idealism, carried further his work, and settled a great Durham coal strike, may always pass man's powers of explanation.

The writer of this review has undertaken it because he had the great privilege of close intercourse with the person he writes about, and this will, he hopes, atone for the personal touch of anything he says, especially if the Editor is willing to observe the desire he expresses for anonymity. He was privileged to be one of Lightfoot's pupils at Cambridge, as well as later on one of his 'sons' in Durham. Going up to Cambridge after a strict evangelical training, he found his feet set by Lightfoot in a larger room, and having the good fortune to live close to him, was often inspired by the sight of the Professor's bald head at his study table, when he drew down his bedroom blinds at night. He recalls the vast concourse of undergraduates attending the Professor's lectures, which, for lack of a large enough room elsewhere, had to be given in the Great Hall of Trinity. He well remembers such an utterance as 'Union with Christ, not justification

[1] There is a slip on p. 152, where B. P. Eden ascribes some words to Ulysses which belong to Aeneas; *cf.* Virgil, Aen. i, 199, and also Homer, Odys. xii, 208.

by faith, is the central point of St. Paul's teaching,' and with what solemn tones the lecturer reminded certain men who came into the Hall, so as to get marked for attendance, in order to secure a certificate for their future ordination, and then slipped out, how at the most solemn hour of their life they would recall and regret their deception.

It was by doing papers which he took to Lightfoot for correction, that he first imbibed the principle of sound Biblical criticism, finding, for an example, that he agreed with Neander's teaching on early Church History, that 'the gift of divers languages' in the *Acts* need not be interpreted literally.

When one day Lightfoot sent him some proof sheets of one of his Pauline commentaries to correct, he, determined not to disappoint the master, but utterly ignorant as to how to set to work, took them to his coach, the Librarian of Trinity, to be instructed.

He recalls also a famous cartoon, of which he retains a copy, which figured in some shops at Cambridge, of Lightfoot dressed as a ballet-dancer (in reference to his name) with drawn sword driving away the cloven-hoofed author of 'Supernatural Religion,' while Westcott as a clown danced a jig beside his friend. He remembers the shouts of applause which his mention of the new Bishop-elect of Durham drew forth in a speech on Disestablishment at the Union. Lastly, he recalls the modest figure of the same Bishop-elect sitting beneath the pulpit of a Cambridge Church, while Dean Stanley, preaching for the Church Society, greatly eulogised him.

All these are recollections of Cambridge days, prior to the invitation to go and work in the new Diocese of Durham, where for four and a half years as Curate at Bishop Auckland he was to continue close association, and to grow in love and reverence for the great Bishop—so great because so greatly trusting those placed under him, and so greatly trusted in return by them, that the slightest hint or opinion from him at once determined their career and course of action. Those were great days in the North, when vicars could go to Auckland Castle and ask for colleagues of the stuff it produced, and subsequently find that they were fortunate indeed.

> 'It was at first somewhat trying as a young curate to preach with Lightfoot (and often his distinguished visitors) in the congregation. But he soon learned that the Bishop's usual habit was to sleep during most of the sermon.'

Much of profound interest not here mentioned will be found in a more complete setting in this book, where also the readers will be shown how Lightfoot prepared the way for the present general Representative Assembly of the Church, and the stress he laid upon something quite novel in his day, the bringing of the laity into their due position, both in the Councils of the Church, and as entrusted with spiritual ministrations of preaching and of pastoral care. Lightfoot felt certain that 'in this lies the great hope of the future . . .'

It is not necessary here to do more than refer to the invaluable bequest Lightfoot has made to the whole Church by his New Testament, and Early Church History writings, for he was above all a careful historian. Remembering his great work on Clement, it was interesting a few years ago to find one of the monks showing my party over San Clemente in Rome, speaking with respect of the great (Protestant) Bishop.

The Church is facing now great problems of Reunion. Is there not much help to be found still (the Dean of Wells thinks so, *cf.* p. 127) in Light-

foot's 'Essay on the Christian Ministry.' I ventured a short time ago to press the truths it contains, and its witness to the Apostolic origin and authority of episcopacy, upon a large gathering of Free Church Ministers and Laity, who listened with respect to anything Lightfoot said. It speaks the louder because, as Harnack said of him, 'He never defended a tradition for the tradition's sake.'

I would close with two quotations—they should appeal to all Christians —from the book and from Lightfoot himself:

> 'Though the Gospel is capable of doctrinal exposition, though it is eminently fertile in moral results, yet its substance is neither a dogmatic system, nor an ethical code, but a Person and a Life' (p. 121).
>
> 'I believe from my heart that the truth which this (St. John's) Gospel more especially enshrines — the truth that Jesus Christ is the Very God Incarnate, the Manifestation of the Father to Mankind—is the one lesson which duly apprehended will do more than all our feeble efforts to purify and elevate human life here by imparting to it Hope and Light and Strength; the one study which alone can fitly prepare us for a joyful immortality hereafter' (p. 185).

D.S.G.

THE LITERARY GENIUS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*

This volume is a sequel to the Headmaster of Pocklington's previous book, 'The Literary Genius of the Old Testament,' the success of which (he tells us in the Preface), has encouraged him to produce a similar volume on the New Testament. The book, as its title indicates, is an attempt to appreciate the New Testament writings regarded as literature; and we need not hesitate to say that it does its work well. For those who have made no specialised study of the New Testament the book is an excellent introduction to its contents; it requires no knowledge of Greek or of biblical criticism; and, though always interesting and easy to follow, it remains scholarly and well-written. It abounds in quotations and illustrations, and cannot but succeed in what must surely be its main object—to send the serious reader back to his New Testament with added interest, fuller understanding and keener appreciation.

But it is, of course, a very difficult task to discuss the New Testament as literature without also discussing it as history and as theology. In fact, Mr. Sands believes that it is not possible to do so: 'It is not possible to discuss the literary quality of history, historical romance, and fiction in the same terms' (p. 5). Mr. Sands therefore usually tells us what is his point of view with regard to such problems as those of authorship, sources, historical accuracy, etc. He tends to be conservative in his approach: thus, he regards Mark's Gospel as historically reliable and based upon the reminiscences of Peter's own observations (p. 6). Or again, he believes that the authority of John the Apostle lies behind the Fourth Gospel (p. 47). These personal opinions sometimes lead our author to pass comments which are perhaps not quite in place in a book on this subject; thus, commenting upon John i, 14 ('We beheld his glory'), he says, 'As the sentence was being framed, did the memory of this vivid personal experience on the Mount of Transfiguration stir the speaker and make him glow . . . ?' Mr. Sands also thinks that he is justified in regarding the Pastoral Epistles as Pauline for the purposes of his study (p. 128, footnote). The general point of view is roughly that of the S.P.C.K. 'New Commentary.'

**The Literary Genius of the New Testament.* By P. C. Sands. (Clarendon Press: 1932. 214 pp. 6/-.)

One of the most valuable parts of the book is the concluding section (XII) on 'Translations.' Here Mr. Sands discusses the relative merits of such translations as the A.V., the R.V., Moffatt, Weymouth, etc. He supplies us with copious illustrations; and by skilfully placing side by side extracts from two versions, he clearly shows us the advantages of the modern one. One example must suffice: 'Take for instance,' says Mr. Sands, 'the following appeal of St. Paul as it is in the A.V.: "O ye Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged." (An enlarged heart, now a physical derangement!) "Ye are not straitened in us, ye are straitened in your own bowels. Now for a recompense in the same (I speak as unto my children) be ye also enlarged" (II Cor. vi, 11 *f.*). What a strange jargon this must seem to any but close readers of the Bible! How would the plain man regard an appeal "to be enlarged for a recompense in the same"? But see the fog cleared away: "Corinthians, I am keeping nothing back from you; my heart is wide open for you. "Restraint?" That lies with you, not with me. A fair exchange now, as the children say! Open your hearts wide to me" (Moffatt).

ALAN RICHARDSON.

FEATURED SINNERS*

This is a book about the Oxford Groups, and we review it because it is being widely read. To be fair to the Groups we must distinguish between the book and what of the Groups we can see, as through a glass darkly, moving behind the pages. The book has been acclaimed by the Groups, leaders and young alike, but were it all we knew of Groups we could dismiss the movement at once as a stunt which has happened to draw a few good Christians into its vortex.

A charitable reading, and particularly of the first forty pages, which are by far the best, discovers the Groups as a Christian revival. There seems to be experience of God and quickening to sin, a personal awakening to what is shadowed forth in Christian theology. The Groups are also Revival in a narrower sense and possess the characteristics of testimony and God-guidance. For the Groups, testimony is making public confession and telling of conversion, both equally stressed. But the Groups must be judged, and apparently wish to be judged, to some extent also by this book as a whole, which leaves strongly the uncomfortable impression that confession of sin comes first in time and importance in the process of conversion and is the chief characteristic of the religious life afterward. That is not true to Christian experience. Any adolescent might wallow in remorse and make public confession with a certain masochistic enjoyment. The mere natural centralising of his personality, and consequent bringing under control of his instincts for adult life, may sometimes lead to this. Only a Christian adolescent becomes aware of his unworthiness in the light of a previous awareness of the Holiness of God. Tens of conversions recorded in this book are seen to be nearly worthless on one reading of the sixth chapter of Isaiah. 'Guidance' for the Groups appears to be two-fold. It is dimly presented in the book as Christian trust in God, and is vividly shown as specific Divine instruction to act this way or that in the circumstances of every day. Thus the Groups finely insist on a quiet time to be kept each day, but practise jotting down on paper whatever comes into the head at the end of it and acting on such 'controlled' writing. 'Wade Wade Wade, Rose Rose Rose,' runs one such entry made by Frank (Buchman), who, we are told, inspires audiences with such slogans as PRAY—'Powerful Radiograms Always Yours.'

**For Sinners Only.* A. J. Russell. (Hodder & Stoughton: 1932. Price 5/-.)

Some psychologists of twenty years ago would have recognised guidance of the Group sort as phenomena of unconscious cerebration, that is, of one phase of the normal working of the mind. More recently the late Professor Graham Wallas divided up the thought-process into Preparation — the gathering of material — Incubation, Illumination, and Verification. The illumination comes 'on its own,' but because of the preceding conscious effort, and it is of no significance until verified by trial-and-error method. The theory of Quaternions, as is well known, flashed as from on high upon Sir W. R. Hamilton, but he tells us he had felt the intellectual want of the theory, had been occupied with its problem, for the previous fifteen years. On lower planes, perhaps, all solutions and decisions 'flash' upon all of us; the mind consciously only prepares and expects, though few realise this until it be pointed out. Religious Revivalists, suddenly become hyper-self-conscious, apprehend their own thought-processes for the first time and, in the grip of their single obsession, claim Illumination to be God's own voice. It might not matter how they named it, but the danger is they may act on their decisions as infallibilities, for the consequences of which they are not responsible, and that way lies intolerance, bigotry and, if it be desired, a logical justification for the Inquisition. Already some of Mr. Russell's heroes are so sure of their convictions, not only moral but, more dangerously, theological and historical, that they are absolved from arguing them and think an opponent adequately dealt with if they convict him of sin. Since most of us try to be alive to our shortcomings, the outlook for the advance of knowledge and opinion would not seem to be too bright. A further danger of deciding—right or left? he or she? come or go? by reference to God-guidance, is break-down of discrimination, an aspect of the moral judgment itself. Apart from argument, and perhaps necessarily beyond its effective range, everybody outside a lunatic asylum—where persuasive arguments abound—must perceive there is a distinction between a decision, say to be a conscientious objector in war-time, and a decision to use this or that means of travel. Does Professor Grensted seriously maintain God said, 'Don't be a fool; go by car'? And the Objector would only claim his moral decision to be 'of God,' whereas the Groups claim their most trivial devisions to be 'from God.'

In the book itself it is difficult to find much to praise. There are occasional sayings of pith and Christian insight, mostly quotations from Group leaders. 'There is no work of Mine for him who is not wholly Mine.' But the writing generally is atrocious, sentences often verbless, and the style is the worst journalese. The taste is not always impeccable: 'Back God and watch Him win your own Derby.' There are stories of young people whose only excuse can be that the bounding egoism of youth is finding this emotional religious outlet rather than the usual more entertaining, creative, and hopeful channels. No trace is there of that fear of God's mission which made Jeremiah plead he was but a child, nor of that recognition found in the Gospels and Epistles of the real intellectual stresses, the grief and striving, the desires and glory which make up the enigma of life. Indeed Mr. Russell, for one presumably long in touch with men and books, is remarkably ignorant of religious thought, past or present, and of the Scriptures. Because Arnold Bennett confesses he could not believe 'in the divinity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the immaculate conception . . . ,' Mr. Russell, making the elementary confusion of dogma with faith, agrees that he was not 'of the Spirit.' And might not Mr. Russell have looked up Acts before asserting St. Paul made no argument for his faith before Agrippa? The laudation of the Group leaders is fulsome. Every act of ordinary decency,

every kindliness of Frank (Buchman) is hailed as blinding evidence of his intimacy with God. Curiously, these eulogies are printed with permission. Such leaders will soon have to remind us that they are but men of like passions with ourselves. Any connection with a University, and particularly Oxford, awes Mr. Russell: a B.A. is reverenced, more letters worshipped, and a Don ushered breathlessly. Lest we do not fully realise his greatness, Dr. Grensted is first spoken of as Canon, then suddenly as Professor, and once as 'the Bampton lecturer.' 'His boyish self-consciousness . . . takes occasional liberties with his great intellectuality'; 'The Professor's mind is so large . . .'; 'The massive head inclined towards me as we probed deeper the matter of guidance.' Did Professor Grensted really 'give permission' for this to be printed? However, we note with some relief that the Professor knows nothing of the 'super-guidance' which now and again illuminates Mr. Russell.

The good news of the Gospel has become red-hot news. On first glancing through the pages we suspected Mr. Russell of a deliberately planned scoop, tongue in cheek. After reading the first hundred pages our suspicion became a hope, for Mr. Russell's sake, which, unfortunately, the later part of the book did not justify. We believe Mr. Russell to be sincere enough: pages 30—33 leave little doubt of that. But he can be sincere about two opposites simultaneously. He opens his book when he is a writer on a popular daily, and provides us with a sublimely unconscious exposure of Fleet Street scoop methods in religion; proceeds after being 'changed' to see the hollowness of it all, and joins a paper with a smaller circulation; but quickly recovers resiliency and decides to scoop the Groups, whereby the sales of the smaller paper soar, which is difficult to understand if the articles he quotes are typical of what he wrote. He boasts of his headlines: 'Remarkable Religious House-party at Oxford (see page 6). Oxford's New Religious Movement. B.A.'s Who Live on Faith and Prayer'; 'Faith and Prayer Wedding at Oxford.' As we said, the book is here reviewed because it is selling so widely. We doubt if we have heard or read anything that does the Groups so much dis-service. It remains to be decided if the book does so by faithfully reflecting them.

M.T.D.

THE NATURE OF REVELATION *

The value of this little book, like those by the same author on Prayer and Sacraments, is not to be measured by its size and price. Canon Lilley possesses the unusual qualifications of a great knowledge of historical theology, a deep realisation and appreciation of what at its best it sought to accomplish, and a lively sense of its inadequacies when confronted with modern knowledge. In this book he studies the efforts of theology, in its classical period, to define the relations of Religion and Revelation, and of natural knowledge to revealed truth, and he has constructive suggestions to make. The modern tendency has been to cut the knot by confusing the traditional distinction, to the injury, in Canon Lilley's opinion, to Christianity's claim to be of universal validity. He thinks that intellectual opponents who treat modern liberalising views on this suject as eccentricities outside the stream of theological development are justified. He states the traditional belief thus:—

> 'It (Revelation) meant that the will of God for man's redemption and the manner of its accomplishment had been expressly revealed

**Religion and Revelation.* Being the Paddock Lectures for 1931. By A. L. Lilley, Canon and Chancellor of Hereford Cathedral. (S.P.C.K. Price 4/6.)

> beforehand to man by God, that without that Revelation man could never have known anything of God's gracious purpose, that that Revelation was contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and in certain oral traditions communicated by Our Lord to His apostles, that this Revelation of Scripture and tradition was infallible and inerrant in all its parts, that to its original content nothing could ever be added nor from it anything be taken away, and, finally, that its revealed character was guaranteed by the prophetic form in which it was given and by the miracles which God wrought for that express purpose.'

Canon Lilley is very sure that such a statement is impossible of acceptance, except on peril of idolatry, in the light of modern critical studies. He quotes and approves, insisting only on the magnitude of the difference (the significance of which he is concerned, in the constructive part of his book, to reduce), the statement of a Committee of Bishops at Lambeth that

> '. . . in spite of the light long since thrown upon the conditions under which its several books were written, and upon the progressive revelation of sacred knowledge they record, the Bible is even now too often treated as if every statement about God, contained in every part of it, must find a place in our present apprehension of Him.'

Sharing fully the belief in the progressive character of Revelation, Canon Lilley feels the extreme difficulty and the hazardous nature of the step from Revelation with a capital R to revelation with a small r.

Three lectures expound the traditional philosophy of Revelation, particularly its expression in the thirteenth century, and the work is done with an ease and lightness of touch which separates the essentials from the details in a way only possible to a man whose knowledge of the subject is as deep as his sympathy with it.

For our readers the constructive part of the book will be its main interest. Criticism challenges the historic view of Revelation as divine history, as the history of man as seen from God's side and as told by Him. Canon Lilley selects the relevant portions of the famous Bampton Lectures of Dr. J. B. Mozley, and the Decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870, as showing how the challenge was first met: these refused any entry to criticism, regarding it as a blasphemous intrusion into things divine. Both fail. Neither the Church nor the Bible can guarantee the divine character of the other except within the ambit of a faith which embraces them both.

The other way of meeting the challenge has been to revise the conception of Revelation so that the results of criticism no longer conflict with it. This has been the tendency of Anglican apologetic. Canon Lilley's sympathy with the Barthian theologians is due to the fact that, while in no way minimising the human element in Revelation, they equally do not abate the earlier claims made for it. Man hears the word of God *through* Scripture and the Church, but neither of these media is identical with it: the word becomes ever clearer as it brings us nearer its personal attainment in the Incarnation. Canon Lilley thinks that the only reason why such a conception was not formerly taught explicitly was because there was so little occasion to consider the existence of a human element in Scripture. But he is equally clear that the Barthian theology as a whole will not do. It is right in regarding religion as the bond between man and God, and that it is of God's origination: 'yet in that bond man surely counts for something.' Religion is the bond which constitutes true personality, but there must be in man the stuff of which personality is made.

> 'The Barthian condemnation of the claim to freedom of the natural man as his original and irremissible sin, so long as it is persisted in, as a truculent rebellion against divine authority, and its complementary conception of God as sheer unmitigated authority, seem to me the chief weaknesses of that theology, both psychologically and religiously.'

The psychological weakness is that without freedom personality is quite impossible; the religious weakness is that the Barthian concept is at variance with the witness of Revelation itself:—

> 'Even in the primitive stages of religion the divine authority was recognised by Elijah, not in the whirlwind and earthquake which in turn shook his mountain fastness, but in a still, small voice. And when at last God came to reveal Himself in the fulness of His eternal majesty He left all visible majesty behind.'

Canon Lilley exposes the fallacy involved in thinking that one may accept the more radical results of New Testament criticism and then claim that nothing is lost because, after all, we receive the Scriptures on the authority of the Church, which still speaks with a living voice. If this means that the Church decided the limits of the New Testament Canon, it is obviously true as a statement of history; but if it means that the authority of the Scriptures is derived from that of the Church, it is a theological novelty, and a false one. For the consistent theological doctrine has been

> '. . . that the primary rôle of Church and Synagogue was that of authenticating witness to the exclusive claim of certain writings to be of divine origin . . . Every attempt, therefore, to exalt the authority of the Church at the expense of that of Holy Scripture is not only illogical but suicidal.'

The Church is 'a witness and keeper of Holy Writ,' but not the source of its authority or inspiration. This position can be abandoned only at the cost of implying for the New Testament a lower Revelational value than for the Old.

Canon Lilley's main point is to emphasise what he regards as a definite trend in modern theology. There is no unbridgable gap between truths of reason and those of faith, but neither is there simple equivalence. The essential thing is to distinguish *the methods by which anything comes to be believed* from the reasons why it is true or false, good or bad.

> 'To assert that God is infinite, unchangeable, incorporeal, impassible adds nothing to our positive knowledge of His nature. It does nothing more than state, with the aid of a negative prefix, certain incompatibilities of which reason becomes aware in its analysis of the idea of a Supreme Being.'

On the other hand, Revelation has a personal character:—

> 'It affirms of God qualities which are altogether outside and beyond the cold pale of reason—that He is merciful, compassionate, gracious, forgiving, that He is redeeming love. Not only could the reason, in its affective aloofness, never have attained to such affirmations about a Supreme Being, but it has always been the chief difficulty of theology . . . to reconcile these metaphysical attributes of Deity with the strictly religious apprehension of God.'

But the value of this book is that, unlike the usual attitude of those who hold that religion is an autonomous sphere of knowledge, and that, alike by the manner of its reception and by its positive content, its knowledge has a distinctive content which fully justifies its description as a revelation, Canon Lilley is quite explicit as to the place of reason and of natural know-

ledge in theology. The very existence of the New Testament canon bears witness to the human capacity to recognise Revelation. But

> '. . . to receive a revelation and to distinguish it afterwards from what is not revelation are both evidences and effects of one and the same self-revealing Power, even though the former may have a priority of religious value over the latter.'

Any possible Revelation must always be received through the prism of humanity. Canon Lilley says of Scotus Erigena that he planted reason at the heart of all revelation, and constituted it as the final interpretative authority thereof. Moreover

> '. . . the Revelation which is self-authenticating in the substance of its content, which needs no miracle to authenticate it, is brought *as to its whole content* within the ambit of reason, and is thereby something different from Revelation in the traditional sense.'

Thus it is that Canon Lilley can say that we may have to go back to something like the position of Erigena for a conception of Revelation which will satisfy the demands of reasonableness without sacrificing the indispensable requirements of religion. It is much to be hoped that the many who will appeal to this little book as vindicating the fundamental importance and the fact of Revelation will not overlook its equally fundamental opposition to the various irrationalisms current in these days. If they do they will pervert the author's meaning.

J. S. Bezzant.

PALESTINE AND SYRIA

Professor A. T. Olmstead's History of Assyria has established itself as an outstanding work on the subject, and has been of service to many students of Oriental history. The publication therefore of another ambitious work by the same author, a history of Palestine and Syria, will have aroused great and widespread interest.* The University of Chicago, noted for its enterprise in Oriental research, having recognised that Oriental history is a big subject which demands the undivided attention of an investigator, Professor Olmstead is free to pursue his researches uninterruptedly and is spared the temptation of teaching and writing about half-a-dozen different subjects at the same time. How many universities in Great Britain have a Chair of Oriental History? How many of them attach proper importance to a history which is many centuries older than what, by a curious survival, they are pleased to call ancient history?

Professor Olmstead's *History of Palestine and Syria* is of special interest. He writes purely as an historian, and as an expert in history who keeps himself fully abreast of all the latest discoveries. Thus, not to mention Jericho, he has drawn material from the excavations which have been carried on by the French Government for the last four years at the coast village of Ras Shamra in Syria, excavations which reveal a remarkable mingling of cults in the Homeric or pre-Homeric Age — Minoan, Mycenaean, Phoenician, Syrian, Babylonian—and throw new light on the history of the alphabet.

The writer's treatment of the Hebrew sources is sanely critical and free from prejudice. Like others, he finds that monotheism was in existence long before it was accepted by the Hebrews. Indeed, the hymn of the Egyptian King Ikhnaton, which presents the essence of his teaching, ' forms

**History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest.* By A. J. Olmstead, Professor of Oriental History, University of Chicago. (Charles Scribner's Sons: 1931. pp. xxxiii, 664. 30/- net.)

so remarkable a parallel to the one hundred and fourth psalm that some relationship cannot be denied. It is no longer possible to believe that monotheism originated with the Hebrews; is it possible that Ikhnaton's monotheism survived in Canaan to influence the Hebrew prophets? We cannot doubt that Ikhnaton attempted to propagate his religion in that Syria which is placed before Egypt in the hymn; certain passages in the Syrian letters have even been explained as references to the new teaching. However that may be, the remarkable parallels to the Hebrew monotheism and the still more remarkable parallels to the Hebrew psalms demand an adequate explanation.' The names of Jacob-el ('Jacob is god') and Joseph-el ('Joseph is god') are taken to indicate clearly that these two patriarchs were once true deities. As regards the Exodus, 'the tradition of a captivity in Egypt is so persistent, it fits so well with contemporary conditions, it is so unthinkable that any people could have invented an episode so little to their credit, that we must assume a solid basis for the belief.' But the body of Israelites which Moses led forth was comparatively small. 'Earlier traditions of the tribes who settled in North and Central Canaan and across Jordan show clearly that originally they knew nothing of an exodus from Egypt, and these traditions fit badly the later story of an exodus of the whole people into which they have been incorporated. Furthermore, we have found Hebrews in Canaan long before the date of the supposed Pharaoh of the Exodus.' King David's reign, according to Olmstead, marks the beginnings of Hebrew literature. 'Stories of the fathers and of the early heroes were written in the new script adapted from the Phoenician, official chronicles told of David's wars. Poetry flourished. David himself was no minor poet, as witness the magnificent threnody on Saul's death.' As regards Josiah's reform, 'to many a thinking and pious Hebrew, Josiah's reform must have appeared the utter negation of all that was best in the nation's past.' Its effect on the peasant was most deplorable. 'His friends, the local priests, were dead or nonentities in the capital, his first fruits eaten by strangers. By the new mode he could be religious only in Jerusalem, and then only at the three yearly festivals. He must tramp the unspeakable trails on foot and under the blazing sun at an expense which, however small, was too great for his scanty means, and then worship with strangers. Intimate relation between official religion and the home life was broken and forever. The peasant became a "pagan," one of the "people of the land," as they were stigmatised by the officially "pious." All opportunity for influence by the advanced thinkers was lost when Josiah's reform snapped the connection between the official cult and the daily life of the peasant.'

Particularly interesting is Professor Olmstead's account of the circumstances and religion of the 'Jewish mercenaries settled at Yeb, the later Elephantine, which with its sister garrison of Sun or Syene across the river guarded the southern border at the first cataract.' These exiled Jews brought with them their religion, but it is by no means what we have been accustomed to call Hebrew. Their god Yahu possessed a temple in Yeb as early as 525, and it continued in use over a century. Josiah's reform had not touched Yeb. The temple had an altar on which were presented meal offerings, incense offerings, and whole burnt offerings. 'There is no mention of feasts until near the end, no Sabbath stops their labour, the law is unknown, neither Moses nor any other of the early heroes is commemorated in their names. They have priests, but there is no hint that they were considered sons of Aaron or even of Levi.'

Those who have read the author's *History of Assyria* will know that he is fond of clothing ancient history in modern dress. The result is not

always pleasing. The reader who does not know Hebrew will be puzzled by some of the place-names as given in this new work. What will he make, for instance, of 'Meadow of the Feast,' 'Twin Ramahs,' 'Cheesemakers' Vale'? But on the whole Professor Olmstead's *History* deserves high praise. It will be a welcome addition to every library. No expense has been spared to make the volume attractive in every way. It is enriched also by many excellent illustrations.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

PLOUGH AND SEED*

An appraisement of the books of the Modernist Series must, to be relevant, have regard to their purpose. They are not addressed to the unconverted, nor to clergy, nor to persons quite happy and satisfied with the teachings of this or that school in the English Church, but primarily to that increasingly numerous section of the laity whose modern education and outlook leads them, while loyal to their Church, to be dissatisfied with her current teaching and practices, even to be irritated and resentful. As Mr. Griffith says, 'Typical English folk of goodwill and level judgment are often loyal to the Church despite itself . . .' There is no more mixed and difficult an audience to-day, except perhaps that before the mind of a B.B.C. speaker. Mr. Griffith and his fellows can certainly not presume in their readers total ignorance, nor yet wide understanding, of the Church, and its theology. They must and best can help the laity by showing them exactly why dissatisfaction arises, and so incidentally must frankly admit the defects in the present order; they must re-educate their readers in the significance and value of the Christian religion and of the Church, and so must give much instruction, historical and theological. Taken by and large, Mr. Griffith in this book accomplishes much of these hard tasks satisfactorily by direct, even bald, statements in untechnical language, sometimes at the price, probably consciously paid, of laying himself open to criticism from professional theologians and pure stylists.

We ourselves think that if Mr. Griffith had to criticise adversely the motive and position of the Tractarians, it would have been more fair also to remind us that they brought light and colour and the beginnings of a return to the primitive to a church badly in need of these things. Nor do we think that Otto can be so easily dismissed as might appear on page 45; and we cannot agree that Roman Modernism was 'strangled at birth.' Again, it is not true to suggest (p. 25) that scholars have not been concerned to discover how far the writers of the Gospels were conscious artists. The appendices, and particularly the note on Our Lord's birth, could profitably have been fuller. At least it might have been pointed out that a layman can see the manuscript evidence easily and clearly presented in Professor Streeter's 'Four Gospels.' The citing of St. Paul's references to the birth omits mention of Galatians iv, 4, which is strong evidence, *ab silentio*, against a miraculous mode.

But these are small points. The layman's dissatisfaction with the Church, whether he still attends it or has regretfully drifted away, springs not from reasoned theological opinion. He is usually unable to state precisely his grievance. He feels dumbly but keenly that 'the whole atmosphere is musty and the religious teaching antiquated. His common sense has been outraged . . . Instead of being inspired he has been thoroughly irritated and cast down in spirit.' 'Sensible people depart from Church

**The Necessity of Modernism.* R. G. Griffith, M.A. (The Modernist Series. Skeffington and Son, Ltd.: 1932. Price 3/6.)

with the conviction that in Church you must expect solemn make-belief and inefficiency.' Mr. Griffith is *sympathique* to this temper and understands it. He places his finger on particular sore points: a passage in the Litany; one of the Comfortable Words; some answers in the Catechism; the fact that the great Festivals of Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday are alleged to have been attended at their initiation by 'volcanic disturbances of the natural and accepted order': the layman will have nothing to do with the Prayer Book conceptions, still current, of vicarious sacrifice, propitiation and miracle, and he is right. And we believe Mr. Griffith's broad generalisation to be accurate: 'The nation does not want an increased and excessive emphasis on sacramental worship.' Very properly there are also in the book some constructive suggestions for Prayer Book revision, and an attempt to recapture the early significance of the Communion Service.

Mr. Griffith, as a parish clergyman awake to the alienation of the nation at large from the Church, which for some time has been all but complete, is moved by the desperate need to speak plainly, be it at the risk of offending those religious people content with a minimum of thinking or with half-beliefs. He is certain of the worth and necessity of the English Church, and shares the conviction characteristic of Modernists that, just as the essentials of Christianity can only acquire a new glory in the unshielded light of modern knowledge, so the place and function of Modernism is properly within the Church. 'L'Église souffre en moi, j'aurai la paix en elle.'

This book may be recommended to the laity. Against unsympathetic experts it is not altogether water-tight; though here we record our conviction that Mr. Griffith's presentation of the Incarnation, or something very like it—an event which provides the centre of gravity for the religious and theological position found in the book—will eventually be endorsed by the Modern world, which in this matter will be but returning to the spirit of the Old. Many Church politicians will not regard the book as 'safe'; but it is unambiguous and can be understood. The time has long passed, if it were ever right, for what is assuredly now the ecclesiastical impertinence of viewing the laity as uninformed children who cannot be trusted to ponder, weigh, and criticise for themselves, and who, therefore, can only be comforted by vague ambiguities couched in the language of a traditional piety.

The dust-cover twice wrongly advertises the author's name as *Griffiths*, and the introductory note is dated 1930 in mistake for 1932. *'That'* is misprinted for 'than' on page 72, and *'world'* for 'word' on page 122.

M.T.D.

ASIA AND ITS CULTURES

Few men have such a working knowledge of the countries of the East as has Dr. Kenneth Saunders. Most of his life has been spent in one or other of them, and his knowledge of their cultures and philosophies and his friendship with Kagawa and Gandhi are all an admirable qualification for the writing of this book on *The Heritage of Asia* (S.C.M., 5/-). Many readers will probably turn first to the biographical sketches of the three great modern reformers: Gandhi, Hu Shih and Kagawa. (We are tempted to call them the Calvin, Erasmus and Luther of the East, but the resemblances go only a certain way.) This is certainly the easiest part of the book and one full of interest. But the first part is equally important and worth the little extra effort to follow the ideas and terminology of the East. It is a survey of the three great civilisations which, though centuries old, are expressing themselves in new ways through these modern re-

formers, who have in their turn been inspired by the stimulus of Western activity. India with its mystical quest of the Unseen, its multitude of self-governing villages drawing culture from legend and song, and colour from religious pilgrimages, has produced Gandhi, the mystic and social reformer. Japan with its heritage of religious ideas expressed in terms of loyalty, generosity and restraint, has produced Kagawa, who is giving these ideas new significance and expression. China with its age-long culture and its ancient feudal system finding a high place in its social order for the scholar, is finding its Renaissance through Hu Shih. This book provides an introduction to these cultures and religions, and concludes with an anthology of illustrative readings. It is a contribution of great interest and value, and especially suitable for study circles of young people who want to understand that East which is so rapidly becoming West. We recommend it heartily. J.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

ERASMUS AND OXFORD.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

I was deeply grieved to find that Archdeacon Hunkin, in his brilliant paper on 'The Reformation and the Scriptures,' had repeated the old slander that Erasmus was an Oxford man. It is true that Knight, a Cambridge man, originated the slander, and even suggested that Erasmus taught at Cambridge the Greek which he had learnt at Oxford; but recent research has cleared Erasmus of the charge. The mistake arose over the dating of certain of his letters (see P. S. Allen, *Erasmi Epistolae* I, p. 241). Erasmus actually was only a visitor to Oxford for a few weeks in the Michaelmas Term of 1499, and never, so far as we know, became a member of the University.

As a quotation from the writings of Erasmus stands on the cover of *The Modern Churchman*, and as our President repeatedly commends his methods, we, as Modern Churchmen, ought to care for his honour and reputation, as well as cherish his teaching. But I wonder how many of us really know anything about him?

L. ELLIOTT BINNS, D.D. (Cantab.).

Springwell House,
Springwell, Saffron Walden.
October 29th, 1932.

[A Scotsman had claimed that Shakespeare was a Paisley man. When asked why, he replied that 'Shakespeare's abilities warranted the inference.'—ED., *M.C.*]

THE DOGMATIC TEMPER.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

At the closing session of the Modern Churchman's Conference at Bristol, Dr. Major, pleading for 'a new Reformation,' said one of the chief needs was 'dogmatic reform.' Dr. Streeter in the discussion suggested that a greater need is 'reform in our attitude to dogma.' This amendment Dr. Major accepted, and many others must have welcomed it. Far more practicable, it is also more radical. The fact is our attitude to dogma has

been, and is increasingly, changing. A notable evidence of this is the disuse of the *Quicunque Vult* in so many churches, which is recognized in the Deposited Book by alteration of the rubric to direct that it 'may'—not *shall*—'be sung or said,' and so on occasions which 'may'—be fewer. Similar disuse of the Apostles' Creed in Morning and Evening Prayer is likely enough to come quietly before long; for many feel difficulties in reciting it as it stands, and many more feel no need for the continual repetition of it when met for common prayer and praise and meditation on the Scriptures.

A simple change in the order of Matins, which is desirable on quite other grounds, might also be found helpful here. At present the *Te Deum* is the canticle which usually follows the Old Testament Lesson, to which it bears no relation; and the *Benedictus* usually follows the New Testament Lesson. But the *Benedictus* is exactly fitted to make the transition from the O.T. to the N.T. Scripture, partaking in character of both. The *Te Deum,* on the other hand, is Christian through and through, notwithstanding the last clauses drawn from psalms, and it would come far more appropriately after the N.T. Lesson. But the *Te Deum* is more than a canticle; it is a veritable creed. And it is a creed of the finest form for worship, for while it affirms the majesty and the Incarnation of God, it lifts the heart to praise him no less than the mind to contemplate Him. If the two canticles were interchanged, the accustomed place for faith's affirmation after the word of God has been heard would be most adequately filled, no other creed being required. And this modification in the order of service would probably be welcome to almost everyone who wishes to make our common worship most truly effective.

No dogmatic reform is involved in this, but it would help the more urgently needed reform in our attitude to dogma, and give to the affirmation of Christian faith in common the character it ought to have in worship, instead of that unfortunately impressed upon it by Hellenic intellectualism which has been left behind.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

THE CHURCH AND SLUMS.

Dear Sir, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

This subject is being discussed *ad nauseam* in the newspapers, clerical and lay. It is a useful plank for the enemies of the Church. It is a matter for debate to those who live by conferences. The attack on slums might be the beginning of a gesture, a movement, by which the Church would save the world.

How many good Christians realise how far the records of Our Lord's life and teaching deal with conditions of this world? To read one's New Testament from this angle is a revelation in itself. When He gave to His disciples power to heal 'all manner of sickness and all manner of disease,' He also 'gave them power against unclean spirits.' It is the unclean spirits of hopelessness, of envy and covetousness, of degradation and despair, of embitterment against the injustices of our social system, which are waiting to be cast out to-day by His disciples. And nothing is casting them out better than the attacking movement of the Church in pulling down the slums and erecting upon their dust homes fair to see and dwell in.

Stewart Headlam wrote towards the end of his life: 'Whether or not I was right in making the Sign of the Cross in the air . . . is a matter of infinitesimal importance compared with the facts that in the London diocese

and the Canterbury province so many little children have no clean beds to sleep in, so many of our dearly beloved brethren have not healthy homes to live in.'

The Bethnal Green which he loved has not forgotten him. His portrait is in the museum which he helped to win for the people. The Men's Institute in Wolverley Street, largely his creation, flourishes. A school in one of the poorest districts bears his name. One can find by means of a plaque the house in Wilmot Street where he dwelt. But alas! the slums are still there, and the Church at large does little to hold up the hands of those who would vindicate her honour in this matter, push the war into the enemies' camp, and rescue those who are hopeless, degraded, embittered, and think they have no use for Christianity. The Bethnal Green and East London Housing Association is putting up a brave fight, but badly needs ammunition in the shape of capital. It asks for loans of sums from £1 upwards, at a low rate of interest, to allow families now living in one room to have a flat of three rooms. 'If ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye?'

Our inarticulate masses still look to the Church as a righter of wrongs and an instrument for social justice. In Europe there is no such connection in the popular mind. There is no Christian Socialism. We owe it to men like Stewart Headlam and to others of an earlier time that the door is still left open for the Church to show herself a true disciple of Her Master, the champion of the poor and of the oppressed.

H. M. LARKE, *Secretary*,
Bethnal Green and East London Housing Association, Ltd.

21 Old Ford Road, London, E.2.

[N.B.—The Secretary's letter has been somewhat condensed for reasons of space. His Association so far has bought and improved slum properties, and lets them at 4/6 per week per habitable room, inclusive of rates. Loans are asked to maintain this excellent work and to proceed later with careful schemes of thorough slum clearance.—ED., *M.C.*]

AN ORDER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

I venture to make an appeal to those who are commonly known as Modern Churchmen. I take it that the root idea of that school is an intense belief in the present guidance of the Holy Spirit, who teaches *all* forms of sound knowledge, and is ever working in the world, so that the present age is not inferior to any former age.

This being so, it seems to me that a great need of the present time is a more explicit recognition of the work, and a more intense devotion to the Holy Spirit.

We all know what great help the Roman Church has received from the establishment of the Jesuits, the Order specially devoted to our Lord Jesus. Would it not be possible for some member, or group of members, of the Modern School to inaugurate an Order of the Holy Spirit?

It seems to me that such an Order might give that touch of enthusiasm to the Modern School without which it is in danger of deteriorating into a merely intellectual movement.

HERBERT W. H. GREEN.

Bidford House, Leamington.